

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

FEBRUARY 22, 1889.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Woman Suffrage, submitted the following

### VIEWS OF THE MINORITY:

[To accompany Report No. 2543.]

The undersigned, minority of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, dissent from the views of the majority.

In the Forty-ninth Congress the minority of the committee submitted the following views:

[Senate Report No. 70, part 2, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

The undersigned, minority of the Committee of the Senate on Woman Suffrage, to whom was referred Senate resolution No. 5, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant the right to vote to the women of the United States, beg leave to submit the following minority report, consisting of extracts from a little volume entitled "Letters from a Chimney Corner," written by a highly cultivated lady, Mrs. C. F. Corbin, of Chicago. This gifted lady has discussed the question with so much clearness and force that we make no apology to the Senate for substituting quotations from her book in place of anything we might produce. We quote first from chapter 3, which is entitled, "The value of suffrage to women much overestimated."

The fair authoress says:

"If women were to be considered in their highest and final estate as merely individual beings, and if the right to the ballot were to be conceded to man as an individual, it might perhaps be logically argued that women also possessed the inherent right to vote. But from the oldest times, and through all the history of the race, has run the glimmer of an idea, more or less distinguishable in different ages and under different circumstances, that neither man nor woman, is, as such, individual; that neither being is of itself a whole, a unit, but each requires to be supplemented by the other before its true structural integrity can be achieved. Of this idea, the science of botany furnishes the most perfect illustration. The stamens on the one hand and the ovary and pistil on the other, may indeed reside in one blossom, which then exists in a married or reproductive state. But equally well, the stamens or male organs may reside in one plant, and the ovary and pistil or female organs may reside in another. In that case, the two plants are required to make one structurally complete organization. Each is but half a plant, an incomplete individual by itself. The life principle of each must be united to that of the other; the twain must be indeed one flesh before the organization is either structurally or functionally complete.

"Now, everywhere throughout nature, to the male and female ideal, certain distinct powers and properties belong. The lines of demarkation are not always clear, not always straight lines; they are frequently wavering, shadowy, and difficult to follow; yet on the whole, wherever physical strength, personal aggressiveness, the intellectual scope and vigor which manage vast material enterprises are emphasized, there the masculine ideal is present; on the other hand, wherever refinement, tenderness, delicacy, sprightliness, spiritual acumen and force are to the fore, there the feminine ideal is represented, and these terms will be found nearly enough for all practical purposes to represent the differing endowments of actual men and women. Different powers suggest different activities, and under the division of labor here indicated the control of the State, legislation, the power of the ballot would seem to fall to the share of man. Nor does this decision carry with it any injustice, any robbery of just

or natural right to woman. In her hands is placed a moral and spiritual power far greater than the power of the ballot. In her married or reproductive state, the forming and shaping of human souls in their most plastic period is her destiny. Nor do her labors or her responsibilities end with infancy or childhood. Throughout his entire course, from the cradle to the grave, man is ever under the moral and spiritual influence and control of woman. With this power goes a tremendous responsibility for its true management and use. If woman shall ever rise to the full height of her power and privileges in this direction, she will have enough of the world's work upon her hands without attempting legislation.

"It may be argued that the possession of civil power confers dignity, and is of itself a re-enforcement of whatever natural power an individual may possess; but the dignity of womanhood, when it is fully understood and appreciated, needs no such re-enforcement, nor are the peculiar needs of woman such as the law can reach. Whenever laws are needed for the protection of her legal status and rights, there has been found to be little difficulty in obtaining them by means of the votes of men; but the deeper and more vital needs of woman and of society are those which are outside altogether of the pale of the law, and which can only be reached by the moral forces lodged in the hands of woman herself, acting in an enlarged and general capacity. For instance, whenever a man or woman has been wronged in marriage, the law may, indeed, step in with a divorce; but does that divorce give back to either party the dream of love, the happy home, the prattle of children, and the sweet outlook for future years which were destroyed by that wrong? It is not a legal power which is needed in this case; it is a moral power, which shall prevent the wrong, or, if committed, shall induce penitence, forgiveness, a purer life, and the healing of the wound. This power has been lodged by the Creator in the hands of woman herself, and if she has not been rightly trained to use it there is no redress for her at the hands of the law. The law alone can never compel men to respect the chastity of women. They must first recognize its value in themselves, and by their own courageous and upright living—by living up to the high level of their duties as maidens, wives, and mothers—they must impress men with the beauty and sacredness of purity, and then whatever laws are necessary and available for its protection will be easily obtained, with a certainty, also, that they can be enforced, because the moral sentiments of men will be enlisted in their support.

"Privileges bring responsibilities, and before women clamor for more work to do, it were better that they should attend more thoughtfully to the duties which lie all about them, in the home and social circle. Until society is cleansed of the moral foulness which infests it, which, as we have seen, lies beyond the reach of civil law, women have no call to go forth into wider fields, claiming to be therein the rightful and natural purifiers. Let them first make the home sweet and pure, and the streams which flow therefrom will sweeten and purify all the rest.

"As between the power of the ballot and this moral force exerted by women there can not be an instant's doubt as to the choice. Nor is it very plain to be seen how women can yield both. It is a question of having your cake and eating it too. In natural refinement and elevation of character the ideal woman stands a step above the ideal man. If she descends from this fortunate position to take part in the coarse scramble for material power, what chance will she have as against man's aggressive forces; and what can she possibly gain that she can not win more directly, more effectually, and with far more dignity and glory to herself by the exercise of her own womanly prerogatives? She has, under God, the formation and rearing of men in her own hands. If they do not turn out in the end to be men who respect woman, who will protect and defend her in the exercise of every one of her God-given rights, it is because she has failed in her duty toward them; has not been taught to comprehend her own power, and to use it to its best ends. For women to seek to control men by the power of suffrage is like David essaying the armor of Saul. What woman needs is her own sheepskin sling and her few smooth pebbles from the bed of the brook, and then go forth in the name of the Lord God of Hosts, and a victory as sure and decisive as that of the shepherd of Israel awaits her."

Again, in chapter 4, entitled "The power of the home," the author says:

"It is perhaps of minor consequence that women should have felt themselves emancipated from buttons and bread-making; but that they should have learned to look in the least degree slightly upon the great duties of women as lovers of husbands, as lovers of children, as the fountain and source of what is highest and purest and holiest, and not less of what is homely and comfortable and satisfying in the home, is a serious misfortune. Women can hardly be said to have lost, perhaps, what they have so rarely in any age generally attained, that dignity which knows how to command, united with a sweetness which seems all the while to be complying; the power, supple and strong, which rescues the character of the ideal woman from the charge of weakness, and at the same time exhibits its utmost of grace and fascination. But that of late years the gift has not been cultivated, has not, in fact, thrown out such natural off-shoots as gave grace and glory to some earlier social epochs, must be evident, it would seem, to any thoughtful observer.



"If, instead of striving to grasp more material power, women would pursue those studies and investigations which tend to make them familiar with what science teaches concerning the influence of the mother and the home upon the child, of how completely the Creator in giving the genesis of the human race into the hands of woman has made her not only capable of, but responsible for, the regeneration of the world; if they would reflect that nature by making man the bond-slave of his passions, has put the lever in the hands of women by which she may control him, and if they would learn to use these powers not as bad women do, for vile and selfish ends, but as the mothers of the race ought, for pure and holy and redemptive purposes, then would the sphere of women be enlarged to some purpose; the atmosphere of the home would be purified and vitalized, and the work of redeeming man from his vices would be hopefully begun."

From chapter 1 we make the following extract:

"Is this emancipation of women, if that is the proper phrase for it, a final end, or only the means to an end? Are women to be as the outcome of it emancipated from their world-old "sphere" of marriage and motherhood and control of the moral and spiritual destinies of the race, or are they to be emancipated, in order to the proper fulfillment of these functions? It would seem that most of the advanced women of the day would answer the first of these questions affirmatively. Women, I think it has been authoritatively stated, are to be emancipated in order that they may become fully developed human beings, something broader and stronger, something higher and finer, more delicate, more esthetic, more generally rarefied and sublimated than the old-fashioned type of womanhood, the wife and mother. And the result of the woman movement seems more or less in a line thus far with this theoretic aim. Of advanced women a less proportion are inclined to marry than of the old-fashioned type; of these who do marry, a great proportion are restless in marriage bonds or seek release from them, while of those who do remain in married life many bear no children, and few indeed become mothers of large families. The women's vitality is concentrated in the brain, and fructifies more in intellectual than physical forms. Now women who do not marry are one of two things, either they belong to a class which we shrink from naming, or they become old maids. An old maid may be in herself a very useful and commendable person, a valuable member of society—many are all this—but she has still this sad drawback, she cannot perpetuate herself; and since all history and observation go to prove that the great final end of creation, whatever it may be, can only be achieved through the perpetuity and increasing progress of the race, it follows that unmarried woman is not the most necessary, the indispensable type of woman. If there were no other class of females left upon the earth but the women who do not bear children, then the world would be a failure, creation would be nonplused.

"If then, the movement for the emancipation of woman has for its final end the making of never so fine a quality, never so sublimated a sort of non-child-bearing women, it is an absurdity upon the face of it.

"From the stand-point of the Chimney Corner, it appears that too many even of the most gifted and liberal-minded of the leaders in the woman's rights movement have not yet discovered this flaw in their logic. They seek to individualize women, not seeing apparently that individualized women, old maids, and individualized men, old bachelors, though they may be useful in certain minor ways, are, after all, to speak with the relentlessness of science, fragmentary and abortive so far as the great scheme of the universe is concerned, and often become in addition seriously detrimental to the right progress of society. The man and woman united in marriage form the unit of the race; they alone rightly wield the self-perpetuating power upon which all human progress depends; without which the race itself must perish, the universe become null.

"Reaching this point of the argument, it becomes evident that while the development of the individual man or the individual woman is no doubt of great importance, since, as Margaret Fuller has justly said, "There must be units before there can be union," it is chiefly so because of their relation to each other. Their characters should be developed with a view to their future union with each other, and not to be independent of it. When the leaders of the woman's movement fully realize this, and shape their course accordingly, they will have made a great advance, both in the value of their work and in its claim upon public sympathy. Moreover, they will have reached a point from which it will be possible for them to investigate, reform, and idealize the relations existing between men and women, as it is now impossible for them to do, and to meet in a practical manner the question which more than all others appalls the philanthropist and staggers the practical reformer, namely, the prevention and cure of licentiousness."

We make a few additional quotations from the appendix, entitled, "The relation of woman to the state; practical suggestions:"

"A publication of the foregoing letters in the Chicago Inter-Ocean brought out so many protests from the woman suffragists that in submitting the letters to the public

the writer feels constrained to add a few words concerning what appears to her to be the true place of woman in the state.

"To say that the power of woman is essentially a moral one does not necessarily imply that all women are more moral than all men, nor even that in any given community a majority of women, if allowed to vote, would be found upon the side of measures proposed in the interest of abstract moral excellence. In most communities, notably in large cities, where prostitutes abound, and where thieves and gamblers and saloon-keepers, and the vicious classes generally have their multitude of female adherents, and where, on the other hand, frivolity and the fashionable forms of vice absorb so many women, it may well be doubted if upon any great moral question the majority of women would be found on the side of even practical morality.

"One strong assertion—it can hardly be called an argument—of the woman suffragists is, that if the wives and mothers of any community were allowed to vote they would close saloons, brothels, and gambling houses. But setting aside the question of whether the absolute closing of these places would be, on the whole, a gain to society in its present condition of impurity; whether the best that can be done is not to heal the open ulcer, which indicates and at the same time gives relief to the infamous disease within, but rather so to restrain and circumscribe it that it may not spread the plague by its foul inoculation. Setting this question wholly aside, it is by no means clear to the minds of some who have given the matter deep and prayerful consideration, that the majority of all the women of any community in which vice is openly rampant would vote for such suppression. The good wives and mothers, the pure and true women generally, of any community, are, indeed, invested with a moral force, which if intelligently wielded, is well nigh supreme; but if it is not a force of numbers, like that which prevails in the political world. As a voter, a good woman has no more power in the state than a bad one. At the polls the woman of gifts, culture, of eminent social position, puts herself upon an absolute equality with the vilest drab in the streets. This fact, as expressed in manhood suffrage—the absolute political equality of all male voters—already constitutes in the eyes of many wise statesmen an imminent and deadly peril to the Republic; a peril which would not be in any wise lessened, but greatly complicated by the admission of all women to the privilege of the ballot. In England, where suffrage is bestowed by classes, the force of this objection is greatly diminished. Much as some female leaders of opinion in that country may desire the parliamentary vote for themselves, I greatly doubt if they would rejoice to see it bestowed upon the women of St. Giles and Billingsgate.

"Ought then this moral power, which resides in the good and true women of any community, to be excluded from influence upon the state? By no means. Probably few women have deeper, more positive, or more earnest convictions on this subject than the writer of these lines. But let us examine briefly the foundations upon which the state rests.

"One of the wisest and purest of European republicans, Joseph Mazzini, is recorded as believing that not right, but duty, is the watchword of human progress. Not an unconditional liberty is the foundation of a true state, but the restrained and orderly exercise of proper individual prerogatives.

"Long before you can predicate political duties for woman, you must recognize her duty as wife and mother; as the queen regnant of the home, as the fountain of order, justice, virtue, and charity, the giver of life, and the former of character for future generations. Heaven's supreme excellences center around and find their best earthly expression in the ideal woman and her work.

"To this high office the duty of man is subordinate. He is to furnish the material supplies by means of which the great work of re-creation may be carried on. It is his duty to support the family by his labor, to give it the strength of his counsels, and the protection of his valor. Few women who are good, and true, and faithful mothers, would not resent the idea that it was their duty, also, to furnish the material supplies which nourish the outward form or body of the home.

"'No,' they would say, and say rightly; 'We peril our lives for our children, we give our days and nights to care and anxiety, to burdens of pain and perplexity, which men know nothing of. It is their duty to minister to the material necessities of ourselves and our children, without toil or trouble on our part.'

"Let us carry a similar division of labor into the state. Does not the voice of the true woman respond, 'We furnish citizens, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh; we train them up to manhood in all manly, noble virtues; we give them our patience our faith, our watchfulness, our prayers, and it is little to ask in return that the state, which is managed by them, shall be just and impartial, nay, generous and munificent, to us, who trust our all in their hands.' As a matter of fact, women have too seldom put forth such appeals as this, but whenever and wherever they have done so, at least in this American Republic, they have always found a respectful hearing and a generous response; and the simple and sole reason why women are not endowed with suffrage to-day is, that the majority of the wives and mothers, and good women generally, of this land, have never asked for nor desired it.



"Civil law is the growth of the ages, and, like all other immemorial institutions, it cherishes many imperfections; but these are being removed as rapidly, perhaps, as is consistent with true progress. That there still remain laws upon the statute books which are relics of barbarism, and bear hardly upon woman, is true enough; but let the women of any community unite to define these wrongs and suggest the redress, and there will be no difficulty in obtaining it, not in spite of men, but by means of them. If a woman wants a new house she does not go at work with a pick and spade and trowel to build it herself; she simply sets the men about it, and if she is worthy of a home at all, she has her parlor and kitchen and closets just where she wants them, too. If she desires civil or political improvements, let her go about the work in the same fashion.

"It is this united action, the inspiration coming from women, the execution from men, and the two forces working harmoniously and lovingly together, not pulling awkwardly and angrily apart, that is destined to save the state and save the world."

The above quotations, from the valuable little book already mentioned by our gifted authoress, are so appropriate, so well and so forcibly expressed, that we cheerfully, as already stated, substitute them in place of any production of our own, and respectfully commend them to the Senate and to the country as worthy of careful consideration and reflection.

We also append hereto the minority report submitted by the undersigned in the Forty-eighth Congress.

JOSEPH E. BROWN.  
F. M. COCKRELL.

---

[Senate Report No. 399, Part 2, Forty-eighth Congress, first session.]

The undersigned minority of the Committee of the Senate on Woman Suffrage, to whom was referred S. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, granting the right to vote to the women of the United States, beg leave to submit the following report:

The undersigned believe that the Creator intended that the sphere of the males and females of our race should be different, and that their duties and obligations, while they differ materially, are equally important and equally honorable, and that each sex is equally well qualified by natural endowments for the discharge of the important duties which pertain to each, and that each sex is equally competent to discharge those duties.

We find an abundance of evidence both in the works of nature and in the Divine revelation to establish the fact that the family properly regulated is the foundation and pillar of society, and is the most important of human institutions.

In the Divine economy it is provided that the man shall be the head of the family, and shall take upon himself the solemn obligation of providing for and protecting the family.

Man, by reason of his physical strength and his other endowments and faculties, is qualified for the discharge of those duties that require strength and ability to combat with the sterner realities and difficulties of life. The different classes of outdoor labor, which require physical strength and endurance, are by nature assigned to man, the head of the family, as part of his task. He discharges such labors as require greater physical endurance and strength than the female sex are usually found to possess. It is not only his duty to provide for and protect the family, but as a member of the community it is also his duty to discharge the laborious and responsible obligations which the family owe to the state, and which obligation must be discharged by the head of the family, until the male members of the family have grown up to manhood and are able to aid in the discharge of those obligations, when it becomes their duty in their turn to take charge of and rear each a family, for which he is responsible.

Among other duties which the head of the family owes to the state is military duty in time of war, which he, when able-bodied, is able to discharge, and which the female members of the family are unable to discharge.

He is also under obligation to discharge jury duty, and by himself or his representative to discharge his part of the labor necessary to construct and keep in proper order roads, bridges, streets, and all grades of public highways. And in this progressive age upon the male sex is devolved the duty of constructing our railroads, and the engines and other rolling-stock with which they are operated, of building, equipping, and launching shipping and other water-craft of every character necessary for the transportation of passengers and freight upon our rivers, our lakes, and upon the high seas.

The labor in our fields, sowing, cultivating, and reaping crops must be discharged mainly by the male sex, as the female sex, for want of physical strength, are generally unable to discharge these duties.

As it is the duty of the male sex to perform the obligations to the state, to society, and to the family, already mentioned, with numerous others that might be enumerated, it is also their duty to aid in the government of the State, which is simply a great aggregation of families. Society can not be preserved, nor can the people be prosperous without good government. The government of our country is a government of the people, and it becomes necessary that that class of people upon whom the responsibility rests should assemble together and consider and discuss the great questions of governmental policy which from time to time are presented for their decision. This often requires the assembling of caucuses in the night-time as well as public assemblages in the day-time. It is a laborious task, for which the male sex is infinitely better fitted than the female sex, and after proper consideration and discussion of the measures that may divide the country from time to time, the duty devolves upon those who are responsible for the Government, at times and places to be fixed by law, to meet and by the ballot to decide the great questions of government upon which the prosperity of the country depends. These are some of the active and sterner duties of life to which the male sex is by nature better fitted than the female sex. If, in carrying out the policy of the state on great measures adjudged vital, such policy should lead to war, either foreign or domestic, it would seem to follow very naturally that those who have been responsible for the management of the state should be the parties to take the hazards and hardships of the struggle. Here, again, man is fitted by nature for the discharge of the duty; woman is unfit for it.

So much for some of the duties imposed upon the male sex, for the discharge of which the Creator has endowed them with proper strength and faculties.

On the other hand, the Creator has assigned to woman very laborious and responsible duties, by no means less important than those imposed upon the male sex, though entirely different in their character. In the family she is a queen. She alone is fitted for the discharge of the sacred trust of wife and the endearing relation of mother. While the man is contending with the sterner duties of life, the whole time of the noble, affectionate, and true woman is required in the discharge of the delicate and difficult duties assigned her in the family circle, in her church relations, and in the society where her lot is cast. When the husband returns home weary and worn in the discharge of the difficult and laborious task assigned him, he finds in the good wife solace and consolation which is nowhere else afforded. If he is despondent and distressed, she cheers his heart with words of kindness; if he is sick or languishing, she soothes, comforts, and administers to him as no one but an affectionate wife can do. If his burdens are onerous, she divides their weight by the exercise of her love and her sympathy.

But a still more important duty devolves upon the mother. After having brought into existence the offspring of the nuptial union, the children are dependent upon the mother as they are not upon any other human being. The trust is a most sacred, most responsible, and most important one. To watch over them in their infancy, and, as the mind begins to expand, to train, direct, and educate it into the paths of virtue and usefulness, is the high trust assigned to the mother. She trains the twig as the tree should be inclined. She molds the character. She educates the heart as well as the intellect, and she prepares the future man, now the boy, for honor or dishonor. Upon the manner in which she discharges her duty depends the fact whether he shall in future be a useful citizen or a burden to society. She inculcates lessons of patriotism, manliness, religion, and virtue, fitting the man by reason of his training to be an ornament to society, or dooming him by her neglect to a life of dishonor and shame. Society acts unwisely when it imposes upon her the duties that by common consent have always been assigned to the sterner and stronger sex, and the discharge of which causes her to neglect those sacred and all-important duties to her children, and to the society of which they are members.

In the church, by her piety, her charity, and her Christian purity she not only aids society by a proper training of her own children, but the children of others, whom she encourages to come to the sacred altar, are taught to walk in the paths of rectitude, honor, and religion. In the Sunday-school room the good woman is a princess, and she exerts an influence which purifies and ennobles society, training the young in the truths of religion, making the Sunday-school the nursery of the church, and elevating society to the higher planes of pure religion, virtue, and patriotism.

In the sick room and among the humble, the poor, and the suffering, the good woman, like an angel of light, cheers the hearts and revives the hopes of the poor, the suffering, and the despondent.

It would be a vain attempt to undertake to enumerate the refining, endearing, and ennobling influences exercised by the true woman in her relations to the family and to society when she occupies the sphere assigned her by the laws of nature and the Divine inspiration, which are our surest guide for the present and the future life. But how can woman be expected to meet these heavy responsibilities and to discharge these delicate and most important duties of wife, Christian, teacher, minister of mercy, friend of the suffering, and consoler of the despondent and the needy, if



we impose upon her the grosser, rougher, and harsher duties which nature has assigned to the male sex?

If the wife and the mother is required to leave the sacred precincts of home, and to attempt to do military duty when the state is in peril, or if she is to be required to leave her home from day to day in attendance upon the court as a juror, and to be shut up in the jury-room from night to night, with men who are strangers, while a question of life or property is being considered, if she is to attend political meetings, take part in political discussions, and mingle with the male sex at political gatherings, if she is to become an active politician, if she is to attend political caucuses at late hours of the night, if she is to take part in all the unsavory work that may be deemed necessary for the triumph of her party, and if on election day she is to leave her home and go upon the streets electioneering for votes for the candidates who receive her support, and mingling among the crowds of men who gather around the polls, she is to press her way through them to the ballot-box and deposit her suffrage, if she is to take part in the corporate struggles of the city or town in which she resides, attend to the duties of his honor the mayor, or councilman, or of policeman, to say nothing of the many other like obligations which are disagreeable even to the male sex, how is she, with all these heavy duties of citizen, politician, and office-holder resting upon her shoulders, to attend to the more sacred, delicate, and refining trust to which we have already referred, and for which she is peculiarly fitted by nature? If she is to discharge the duties last mentioned, how is she, in connection with them, to discharge the more refining, elevating, and ennobling duties of wife, mother, Christian, and friend, which are found in the sphere where nature has placed her?

Who is to care for and train the children while she is absent in the discharge of these masculine duties?

If it were proper to reverse the order of nature and assign woman to the sterner duties devolved upon the male sex and to attempt to assign man to the more refining, delicate, and ennobling duties of the woman, man would be found entirely incompetent to the discharge of the obligations which nature has devolved upon the gentler sex, and society must be greatly injured by the attempted change. But if we are told that the object of this movement is not to reverse this order of nature, but only to devolve upon the gentler sex a portion of the more rigorous duties imposed by nature upon the stronger sex, we reply that society must be injured, as the woman would not be able to discharge those duties so well, by reason of her want of physical strength, as the male, upon whom they are devolved, and to the extent that the duties are to be divided the male would be infinitely less competent to discharge the delicate and sacred trusts which nature has assigned to the female.

But it has been said that the present law is unjust to woman; that she is often required to pay taxes on property she holds without being permitted to take part in framing or administering the laws by which her property is governed, and that she is taxed without representation. That is a great mistake.

It may be very doubtful whether the male or the female sex, in the present state of things, has more influence in the administration of the affairs of the Government, and the enactment of the laws by which we are governed.

While the woman does not discharge military duty, nor does she attend courts and serve on juries, nor does she labor on the public streets, bridges, or highways, nor does she engage actively and publicly in the discussion of political affairs, nor does she enter the crowded precincts of the ballot-box to deposit her suffrage, still the intelligent, cultivated, noble woman is a power behind the throne. All her influence is in favor of morality, justice, and fair dealing; all her efforts and her counsel are in favor of good government, wise and wholesome regulations, and a faithful administration of the laws. Such a woman, by her gentleness, kindness, and Christian bearing, impresses her views and her counsels upon her father, her husband, her brothers, her sons, and her other male friends, who imperceptibly yield to her influence many times, without even being conscious of it. She rules, not with a rod of iron, but with the queenly scepter; she binds, not with hooks of steel, but with silken cords; she governs, not by physical efforts, but by moral suasion and feminine purity and delicacy. Her dominion is one of love, not of arbitrary power.

We are satisfied, therefore, that the pure, cultivated, and pious ladies of this country now exercise a very powerful but quiet, imperceptible influence in popular affairs, much greater than they will ever again exercise if female suffrage should be enacted and they should be compelled actively to take part in the affairs of state and the corruptions of party politics.

It would be a gratification, and we are always glad to see the ladies gratified, to many who have espoused the cause of woman suffrage if they could take active part in political affairs, and go to the polls and cast their votes alongside the male sex; but while this would be a gratification to a large number of very worthy and excellent ladies, who take a different view of the question from that which we entertain, we feel that it would be a great cruelty to a much larger number of the cultivated, re-

finer, delicate, and lovely women of this country who seek no such distinction, who would enjoy no such privilege, who would with woman-like delicacy shrink from the discharge of any such obligation, and who would sincerely regret that what they consider the folly of the state had imposed upon them any such unpleasant duties.

But should female suffrage be once established it would become an imperative necessity that the very large class, indeed much the largest class, of the women of this country, of the character last described, should yield, contrary to their inclinations and their wishes, to the necessity which would compel them to engage in political strife. We apprehend no one who has properly considered this question will doubt, if female suffrage should be established, that the more ignorant and less refined portions of the female population of this country, to say nothing of the baser class of females, laying aside female delicacy, and disregarding the sacred duties devolving upon them to which we have already referred, would rush to the polls and take pleasure in the crowded association which the situation would compel of the two sexes in political meetings and at the ballot-box.

If all the baser and all the more ignorant portion of the female sex crowd to the polls and deposit their suffrage, this compels the very large class of intelligent, virtuous, and refined females, including the wives and mothers who have much more important duties to perform, to leave their sacred labors at home, relinquishing for a time the God-given important trust which has been placed in their hands, to go, contrary to their wishes, to the polls and vote, to counteract the suffrage of the less worthy class of our female population.

If they fail to do this the best interests of the country must suffer.

It is now a problem which perplexes the brain of the ablest statesman to determine how we will best preserve our republican system as against the demoralizing influence of the large class of our present citizens and voters, who, by reason of their illiteracy, are unable to read or write the ballot they cast.

Certainly no statesman who has carefully observed the situation would desire to add very largely to this burden of ignorance. But who does not apprehend the fact if universal female suffrage should be established that we will, especially in the Southern States, add a very large number to the voting population whose ignorance utterly disqualifies them to discharge the trust. If our colored population, who were so recently slaves that even the males who are voters have had but little opportunity to educate themselves, or to be educated, whose ignorance is now exciting the liveliest interest of our statesmen, are causes of serious apprehension, what is to be said in favor of adding to the voting population all the females of that race, who, on account of the situation in which they have been placed, have had much less opportunity to be educated than even the males of their own race? We do not say it is their fault that they are not educated; but the fact is undeniable that they are grossly ignorant, with very few exceptions, and probably not one in a hundred of them could read and write the ballot they would be authorized to cast. What says the statesman to the propriety of adding this immense mass of ignorance to the voting population of the Union in its present condition?

It may be said that their votes could be offset by the ballots of the educated and refined ladies of the white race in the same section, but who does not know that the ignorant voters would be at the polls *en masse*, while the refined and educated, shrinking from public contact on such occasions, would remain at home and attend to their domestic and other important duties, leaving the country to the control of those who could afford, under the circumstances, to take part in the strifes of politics, and to come in contact with the unpleasant surroundings before they could reach the polls.

Are we ready to expose the country to the demoralization, and our institutions to the strain, which would thus be placed upon them, for the gratification of a minority of the virtuous and the good of our female population, at the expense of the mortification of a much larger majority of the same class?

It has been frequently urged with great earnestness by those who advocate woman suffrage that the ballot is necessary to the women to enable them to protect themselves in securing occupations, and to enable them to realize the same compensation for the like labor which is received by men. This argument is plausible, but upon a closer examination it will be found to possess but little real force. The price of labor is, and must continue to be, governed by the law of supply and demand; and the person who has the most physical strength to labor, and the most pursuits requiring such strength open for employment, will always command the higher prices.

Ladies make excellent teachers in the public schools; many of them are every way the equals of their male competitors, and still they secure less wages than males. The reason is obvious. The number of ladies who offer themselves as teachers is much larger than the number of males who are willing to teach. The larger number of females offer to teach because other occupations are not open to them. The smaller number of males offer to teach because other more profitable occupations are open to most males who are competent to teach. The result is that the competition for positions of teachers to be filled by ladies is so great as to reduce the price, but as males



can not be employed at that price, and are necessary in certain places in the schools, those seeking their services have to pay a higher rate for them. Persons having a larger number of places open to them with fewer competitors command higher wages than those who have a smaller number of places open to them with more competitors. This is the law of society. It is the law of supply and demand, which can not be changed by legislation.

Then it follows that the ballot can not enable those who have to compete with the larger number to command the same prices as those who compete with the smaller number in the labor market. As the legislature has no power to regulate in practice that of which the advocates of female suffrage complain the ballot in the hands of females could not aid its regulation. The ballot can not impart to the female physical strength which she does not possess, nor can it open to her pursuits which she does not have physical ability to engage in; and as long as she lacks the physical strength to compete with men in the different departments of labor there will be more competition in her department, and she must necessarily receive less wages.

But it is claimed again that females should have the ballot as a protection against the tyranny of bad husbands. This is also delusive. If the husband is brutal, arbitrary, or tyrannical, and tyrannizes over her at home, the ballot in her hands would be no protection against such injustice, but the husband who compelled her to conform to his wishes in other respects would also compel her to use the ballot, if she possessed it, as he might please to dictate. The ballot could therefore be of no assistance to the wife in such case, nor could it heal family strifes or dissensions. On the contrary, one of the gravest objections to placing the ballot in the hands of the female sex is that it would promote unhappiness and dissensions in the family circle. There should be unity in the family.

At present the man represents the family in meeting the demands of the law and of society upon the family. So far as the rougher, coarser duties are concerned, the man represents the family, and the individuality of the woman is not brought into prominence, but when the ballot is placed in the hands of the woman her individuality is enlarged and she is expected to answer for herself the demands of the law and of society on her individual account, and not as the weaker member of the family to answer by her husband. This naturally draws her out from the dignified and cultivated refinement of her womanly position, and brings her into a closer contact with the rougher elements of society, which tends to destroy that higher reverence and respect which her refinement and dignity in the relation of wife and mother have always inspired in those who approached her in her useful and honorable retirement.

When she becomes a voter she will be more or less of a politician, and will form political alliances, or unite with political parties, which will frequently be antagonistic to those to which her husband belongs. This will introduce into the family circle new elements of disagreement and discord, which will frequently end in unhappy divisions, if not in separation or divorce. This must frequently occur when she becomes an active politician, identified with a party which is distasteful to her husband. On the other hand, if she unites with her husband in party associations, and votes with him on all occasions, so as not to disturb the harmony and happiness of the family, then the ballot is of no service, as it simply duplicates the vote of the male on each side of the question, and leaves the result the same.

Again, if the family is the unit of society, and the state is composed of an aggregation of families, then it is important to society that there be as many happy families as possible, and it becomes the duty of man and woman alike to unite in the holy relation of matrimony.

As this is the only legal and proper mode of rendering obedience to the early command to multiply and replenish the earth, whatever tends to discourage the holy relation of matrimony, is in disobedience of this command, and any change which encourages such disobedience is violative of the Divine law, and can not result in advantage to the state. Before forming this relation it is the duty of young men who have to take upon themselves the responsibilities of providing for and protecting the family to select some profession or pursuit that is most congenial to their tastes, and in which they will be most likely to be successful; but this is not permitted to the young ladies, or if permitted, it can not be practically carried out after matrimony. As it might frequently happen that the young man had selected one profession or pursuit and the young lady another, the result would be that after marriage she must drop the profession or pursuit of her choice and employ herself in the sacred duties of wife and mother at home, and in rearing, educating, and elevating the family, while the husband pursues the profession of his choice.

It may be said, however, that there is a class of young ladies who do not choose to marry, and who select professions or avocations and follow them for a livelihood. This is true, but this class compared with the number who unite in matrimony with the husbands of their choice is comparatively very small; and it is the duty of society to encourage the increase of marriages rather than of celibacy. If the larger number of females select pursuits or professions which require them to decline marriage, society

to that extent is deprived of the advantages resulting from the increase of population by marriage.

It is said by those who have examined the question closely that the largest number of divorces is now found in the communities where the advocates of female suffrage are most numerous, and where the individuality of woman as related to her husband, which such a doctrine inculcates, is increased to the greatest extent. If this be true, and it seems to be well authenticated, it is a strong plea in the interest of the family and of society against granting the petition of the advocates of woman suffrage. After all, this a local question, which properly belongs to the different States of the Union, each acting for itself, and to the Territories of the Union, when not acting in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

The fact that a State adopts the rule of female suffrage neither increases nor diminishes its power in the Union, as the number of Representatives in Congress to which each State is entitled, and the number of members of the electoral college appointed by each, is determined by its aggregate population, and not by the proportion of its voting population, so long as no race or class is excluded from the exercise of the right of suffrage.

While the undersigned would vote against female suffrage if the question were to arise in their respective States, they admit the power of the States over the subject-matter. Entertaining these views, they protest against a constitutional amendment which would confer the right of female suffrage in all parts of the Union, without regard to the wishes of the different States at any time after the adoption of the said amendment. They believe that the noble, true, good women of the country should be heard, and as an expression of their views there is hereto appended "Woman's Protest against Woman Suffrage," known as the Lorain Memorial against Woman Suffrage, presented to the Ohio legislature and signed by a large number of the most thoughtful and intelligent women of the cities of Oberlin and Elyria, Ohio, including lady teachers and wives of professors in Oberlin College.

JOSEPH E. BROWN.  
F. M. COCKRELL.

---

#### WOMAN'S PROTEST AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

We acknowledge no inferiority to men. We claim to have no less ability to perform the duties which God has imposed upon us than they have to perform those imposed upon them.

We believe that God has wisely and well adapted each sex to the proper performance of the duties of each.

We believe our trusts to be as important and sacred as any that exist on earth.

We believe woman suffrage would relatively lessen the influence of the intelligent and true, and increase the influence of the ignorant and vicious.

We feel that our present duties fill up the whole measure of our time and ability, and are such as none but ourselves can perform. Our appreciation of their importance requires us to protest against all efforts to infringe upon our rights by imposing upon us those obligations which can not be separated from suffrage, but which, as we think, can not be performed by us without the sacrifice of the highest interests of our families and of society.

It is our fathers, brothers, husbands, and sons who represent us at the ballot-box. Our fathers and our brothers love us; our husbands are our choice and one with us; our sons are what *we make them*. We are content that they represent *us* in the corn-field, on the battle-field, and at the ballot-box, and we *them* in the school-room, at the fireside, and at the cradle, believing our representation even at the ballot-box to be thus more full and impartial than it would be were the views of the few who wish suffrage adopted, contrary to the judgment of the many.

We do therefore respectfully protest against any legislation to establish "woman suffrage" in our land, or in any part of it.

The following letter from the able and distinguished authoress of "Letters from a Chimney Corner," speaks eloquently and logically for itself:

Hon. HENRY W. BLAIR,  
*United States Senator from New Hampshire:*

DEAR SIR: During the last week of the last session of Congress I received, under cover of your own frank, a copy of your report of the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage, delivered to the Senate of the United States, December 8, 1886. In it you make a lengthy quotation from a pamphlet of mine, entitled "Letters from a Chimney Corner." It appears to me that in the argument drawn from this quotation you



mistake utterly the point at issue, and it is my purpose in this letter to direct your attention to this mistake, and to put the argument upon its proper basis. I shall also comment upon certain other considerations put forth therein.

The quotation referred to is too long for the limits of a letter like this. The argument briefly is, that neither the man nor the woman is individually the representative of the *genus homo*, but that, according to nature and revelation, the two united make one, and that to each constituent of that union certain distinct powers and properties belong, each dependent upon the other, in a minor way, for proper fulfillment. You say, "If upon this account woman is to be denied suffrage, then man equally should be denied the ballot, if his highest and final estate is to be something else than a mere individual."

Now, marriage is that partnership upon which the right order of society and the right perpetuation of the species depends. The question is, whether each partner shall keep to that line of labor which nature has marked out, or whether of woman shall be demanded, not only her own share of the labor, but also a large part of that which belongs to man. For, let us notice, that while it may be granted that woman has the physical capacity to cast a ballot, man has not the physical capacity to bear and nourish children. Nature has made it forever impossible that he should perform that office. If, therefore, he demands of her that she shall participate in those external and general duties, such as labor for the support of the home and for the direction of the state, which his natural constitution, physical and intellectual, fit him for, while he can not by any possibility relieve her of those necessary offices and duties which nature demands of her, he commits a palpable and monstrous injustice.

Nor does it help the matter to say, as you do, that, because woman's nature is purer and nobler than man's the state would be benefited by her participation in political affairs. If men are not capable of managing the affairs of the state according to the highest and best ideas of the race, that is, of both men and women, will you permit me respectfully to inquire what proper and adequate share of this world's work they can perform? What is their natural place in the order of society? Are they mere hewers of wood and drawers of water? They can not bear citizens; they can not care for them in infancy and rear them to manhood. If they can not govern them with wisdom and justice when they are produced ready made to their hands, what is their reason for being? When a man stands up in the United States Senate, and makes such a statement as that, in regard to the men of this Republic, it appears to me that he compromises his own self-respect and the respect due to the dignified and honorable body to which he has been elevated.

You say that you have only proposed the measure because women have asked you to do it. The same plea was made by your great progenitor in the Garden of Eden; but it did not avail him. Moreover, in the case of Adam, it was true. In the present instance the plea contains but the minimum of truth. There are 15,000,000 of women in this country (I quote your own statistics) of voting age. Will you kindly inform us what proportion of that 15,000,000 you have heard from? You say that these women are being governed without their consent. Is it possible that you can sincerely believe that fifteen millions of American women *could* be governed without their consent? Do you not rather feel assured that if a bare majority of that number did not consent, for what appear to them to be good and sufficient reasons to be governed by indirect rather than direct representation, there would be a revolution within twenty-four hours? With every right of agitation at their command which man possesses—free speech, free assembly, the right of petition, a press ever ready to disseminate their views, and many privileges of courtesy besides that men lay no claim to—what power could withstand the moral force of any demand which these fifteen millions should unitedly make?

With what show of reason do you compare free-born American women to the degraded and ignorant slaves on Southern plantations, and speak of men as their masters? As a matter of fact the power of men over women is not greater than that of women over men. Nature lays the infant man a helpless creature in the lap of his mother. He is in her power for life or for death, and for the first ten or fifteen years of his existence, and that during the forming and determining period of his career, a period too, in which he is answerable to no other law than that of his home, her power over him, physical, intellectual, and moral, is so nearly supreme that no power which he can arrogate over her in later years can overbalance it. Under ordinary circumstances the faithful, intelligent mother may make of her son, in all the essentials of manners and morals, whatsoever she will. If American men were to day the narrow-minded, tyrannical, vicious creatures they are charged with being by the woman suffragists, unfitted to be legislators for the whole nation, it could only be because their mothers had misunderstood or neglected the opportunities which Nature puts into their hands. Such a charge is a tremendous indictment against the motherhood of the nation, and, if it could be sustained, ought of itself to bar women from all legislative functions until they can better fulfil that which Nature demands of them in child-bearing and rearing. Moreover, it is the function of slaves to labor;

but it is this nation's pride and boast that in no other country that the sun shines on are there so many homes supported by the loyal and untiring industry of men, where women are kept in ease and comfort, in order that they may give their time to the higher duties of rearing children and planning and carrying on enterprises of charity, philanthropy, and reform; and the influence of these homes upon public sentiment is the one irresistible power in American social and political life. Plainly, if any portion of the American people are slaves it is not the women.

But let us return to the question of the physical adaptability of women to the duties of voters. If women vote, they must also hold office and assume the working duties incident to political campaigns. It appears from the published record of your life that you commenced your political career at about the age of thirty. For the next ten or fifteen years you were actively in politics. Now, will you tell me if you think it would have been convenient or agreeable during those years, when you were laying the foundations of your political success, to have been also engaged in bearing and rearing a family? Could you have done what you found it necessary to do politically, and at the same time have attended properly to your duties as wife and mother? You will say that the very suggestion is indelicate, and I agree with you, but the fault is in the situation as proposed by you. The duties and offices of motherhood are all sweet, and pure, and holy, when kept within the sacred precincts of the home. Brought out into the garish light of publicity what do they become?

Nor will it avail you to say that some part of these offices may be delegated to servants. There are too many mothers of that sort in the country now; no political measure can be a wise one which tends to increase their number.

You say in your report that there are many women who are not wives and mothers. Very true, and when women vote and hold office there will be more of them. A true regard for the best interests of society demands that their number shall be reduced by all natural and reasonable means; but when political rewards are offered as the price of services in public life, do you not believe that many—and those not of the weak and ignorant, but of the more gifted and intellectual—will be tempted to forego marriage and motherhood for the sake of winning them? Woe betide the land which thus offers its political trusts as premiums for childless women! The morals of society are corrupt enough now. What do you suppose they will become when not to be married, not to be a mother, is the prerequisite for a woman's success in a chosen and tempting career? History gives abundant evidence that women are not naturally of purer instincts or more capable of self-control than men. It is only as they are subject to men, as in heathen countries, or yield themselves to the elevating and purifying influences of Christian teaching concerning marriage and the home, that they rise to a higher moral level. Emancipated from these restraints, the intensity of their nature often betrays them into surpassing depths of depravity. I speak advisedly, therefore, and in the light of thirty years' profound and prayerful study of social problems, when I say that the direct tendency of woman suffrage would be to form a class of women such as held high court in Greece in the days preceding its downfall: Women brilliant and intellectual, but wholly wanting in that steadfast faith and abiding virtue which characterizes the Anglo-Saxon ideal of womanhood, I may say the Christian ideal as well—the wife and mother. Are American men prepared to relegate the wives and mothers of this Republic to a secondary and subservient place, and share the political leadership of this great and free country with an oligarchy of Aspasias?

You say that the passage of the proposed resolution would not commit any person to the support of woman suffrage in the end. But what does it do if passed by both Houses? It sends the discussion of this question, backed by the authority of Congress, into every State of this Union. A score or two of the professional advocates of woman suffrage will beat up the entire Territory, and by their noisy persistence will necessitate either that women shall take the field upon the other side or else let the question go by default. Home-loving women—the women who stay in their homes and fulfill the duties of their vocation, and these women are in the great majority in all our States and Territories—have little taste for public strife, and few gifts with which to win battles in the public arena. Still, if needs must, they can and will defend their homes; but, believe me, they will not exonerate from blame those legislators who, by the advocacy of measures like this which you propose, have thrust the hard necessity upon them.

Do you ask me, then, what shall men do, in regard to this cry, which is coming up all over the land, for purer politics, a worthier conduct of affairs? Men know very well what they ought to do about it. They ought to live daily and hourly in the fear of God and for the honor of good women. They ought steadfastly to practice those principles of purity, honor, uprightness, and patriotism, which it is the duty of every Christian home to inculcate. It is very true that the duty is now too often imperfectly performed in our homes; but, believe me, the remedy for this evil does not lie in the direction of woman suffrage. It is by inciting and helping woman to the more faithful discharge of her own duties that legislators will honor



her far more than by dragging her out of the quiet of her own domain, and setting her to perform their neglected and unfulfilled tasks.

Instead of fifteen millions of women voters vainly trying to do the work which God demands of men, there should be fifteen million of happy homes in this broad, fair land; homes supported by the father's labor, made to glow with heaven's own light by the mothers' tender love and care; homes where children are being reared who shall become just and upright men, and faithful, conscientious women; where those virtues are being taught which are the only enduring bulwarks of a free republican government. It is to build up such homes, not to break down their walls and quench the light upon their hearthstones, that legislation ought to be directed.

There are other and weightier arguments against woman suffrage, but these are such as are suggested by the text of your report. I commend them to your earnest consideration before you again address the United States Senate as the champion of woman.

Very respectfully, yours,

THE AUTHOR OF LETTERS FROM A CHIMNEY CORNER.

The authoress of "Letters from a Chimney Corner" is not the only lady whose views are opposed to the Woman Suffragists, as will appear by the following:

### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

LETTER FROM MRS. CLARA T. LEONARD.

The following letter was read by Thornton K. Lothrop, esq., at the hearing before the Legislative Committee on Woman Suffrage, January 29, 1881:

The principal reasons assigned for giving suffrage to women are these:

That the right to vote is a natural and inherent right of which women are deprived by the tyranny of men.

That the fact that the majority of women do not wish for the right or privilege to vote is not a reason for depriving the minority of an inborn right.

That women are taxed but not represented, contrary to the principles of free government.

That society would gain by the participation of women in government, because women are purer and more conscientious than men, and especially that the cause of temperance would be promoted by women's votes.

Those women who are averse to female suffrage hold differing opinions on all these points, and are entitled to be heard fairly and without unjust reproach and contempt on the part of "suffragists," so called.

The right to vote is not an inherent right, but, like the right to hold land, is conferred upon individuals by general consent, with certain limitations, and for the general good of all.

It is as true to say that the earth was made for all its inhabitants, and that no man has a right to appropriate a portion of its surface, as to say that all persons have a right to participate in government. Many persons can be found to hold both these opinions. Experience has proved that the general good is promoted by ownership of the soil, with the resultant inducement to its improvement.

Voting is simply a mathematical test of strength. Uncivilized nations strive for mastery by physical combat, thus wasting life and resources. Enlightened societies agree to determine the relative strength of opposing parties by actual count. God has made women weaker than men, incapable of taking part in battles, indisposed to make riot and political disturbance.

The vote which, in the hand of a man, is a "possible bayonet," would not, when thrown by a woman, represent any physical power to enforce her will. If all the women in the State voted in one way, and all the men in the opposite one, the women, even if in the majority, would not carry the day, because the vote would not be an estimate of material strength and the power to enforce the will of the majority. When one considers the strong passions and conflicts excited in elections, it is vain to suppose that the really stronger would yield to the weaker party.

It is no more unjust to deprive women of the ballot than to deprive minors, who outnumber those above the age of majority, and who might well claim, many of them, to be as well able to decide political questions as their elders.

If the majority of women are either not desirous to vote or are strongly opposed to voting, the minority should yield in this, as they are obliged to do in all other public matters. In fact, they will be obliged to yield, so long as the present state of opinion exists among women in general, for legislators will naturally consult the wishes of the women of their own families and neighborhood, and be governed by them. There can be no doubt that in this State, where women are highly respected and have great

influence, the ballot would be readily granted to them by men, if they desired it, or generally approved of woman suffrage. Women are taxed, it is true; so are minors, without the ballot; it is untrue to say that either class is not represented. The thousand ties of relationship and friendship cause the identity of interest between the sexes. What is good in a community for men is good also for their wives and sisters, daughters and friends. The laws of Massachusetts discriminate much in favor of women, by exempting unmarried women of small estate from taxation; by allowing women, and not men, to acquire a settlement without paying a tax; by compelling husbands to support their wives, but exempting the wife, even when rich, from supporting an indigent husband; by making men liable for debts of wives, and not *vice versa*. In the days of the American Revolution the first cause of complaint was, that a whole people were taxed but not represented. To-day there is not a single interest of woman which is not shared and defended by men, not a subject in which she takes an intelligent interest in which she can not exert an influence in the community proportional to her character and ability. It is because the men who govern live not in a remote country with separate interests, but in the closest relations of family and neighborhood, and bound by the tenderest ties to the other sex, who are fully and well represented by relations, friends, and neighbors in every locality. That women are purer and more conscientious than men, as a sex, is exceedingly doubtful when applied to politics. The faults of the sexes are different, according to their constitution and habits of life. Men are more violent and open in their misdeeds; but any person who knows human nature well, and has examined it in its various phases, knows that each sex is open to its peculiar temptation and sin; that the human heart is weak and prone to evil without distinction of sex. It seems certain that, were women admitted to vote and to hold political office, all the intrigue, corruption, and selfishness displayed by men in political life would also be found among women. In the temperance cause we should gain little or nothing by admitting women to vote, for two reasons: first, that experience has proved that the strictest laws can not be enforced if a great number of people determine to drink liquor; secondly, because among women voters we should find in our cities thousands of foreign birth who habitually drink beer and spirits daily without intoxication, and who regard license or prohibitory laws as an infringement of their liberty. It has been said that municipal suffrage for women in England has proved a political success. Even if this is true, it offers no parallel to the condition of things in our own cities; first, because there is in England a property qualification required to vote, which excludes the more ignorant and irresponsible classes, and makes women voters few and generally intelligent; secondly, because England is an old, conservative country, with much emigration and but little immigration. Here is a constant influx of foreigners—illiterate, without love of our country or interest in, or knowledge of, the history of our liberties—to whom, after a short residence, we give a full share in our Government. The result begins to be alarming—enormous taxation, purchasable votes, demagogism—all these alarm the more thoughtful, and we are not yet sure of the end. It is a wise thought that the possible bayonet or ruder weapon in the hands of our citizens would be even worse than the ballot, and our safer course is to give the immigrants a stake and interest in the Government. But when we learn that on an average 1,000 immigrants per week landed at the port of Boston in the past calendar year, is it not well to consider carefully how we double and more than double the popular vote, with all its dangers and its ingredients of ignorance and irresponsibility? Last of all, it must be considered that the lives of men and women are essentially different. One sex lives in public, in constant conflict with the world; the other sex must live chiefly in private and domestic life, or the race will be without homes and gradually die out. If nearly one-half of the male voters of our State forego their duty or privilege, as is the fact, what proportion of women would exercise the suffrage? Probably a very small one. The heaviest vote would be in the cities, as now, and the ignorant and unfit women would be the ready prey of the unscrupulous demagogue. Women do not hold a position inferior to men. In this land they have the softer side of life, the best of everything. There are, of course, exceptions, individuals, whose struggle in life is hard, whose husbands and fathers are tyrants instead of protectors; so there are bad wives and men ruined and disheartened by selfish, idle women.

The best work that a woman can do for the purifying of politics is by her influence over men, by the wise training of her children, by her intelligent unselfish counsel to husband, brother, or friend, by a thorough knowledge and discussion of the needs of her community. Many laws on the statute books of our own and other States have been the work of women. More might be added.

It is the opinion of many of us, that woman's power is greater without the ballot or possibility of office-holding for gain. When standing outside of politics, she discusses great questions upon their merit. Much has been achieved by women in the anti-slavery cause, the temperance cause, the improvement of public and private charities, the reformation of criminals, all by intelligent discussion and influence upon men. Our legislators have been ready to listen to women, and carry out their



plans when well framed. Women can do much useful public service upon boards of education, school committees, and public charities, and are beginning to do such work. It is of vital importance to the integrity of our charitable and educational administration that it be kept out of politics. Is it not well that we should have one sex who have no political ends to serve, who can fill responsible positions of public trust? Voting alone can easily be exercised by women without rude contact, but to attain any political power women must affiliate themselves with men; because women will differ on public questions, must attend primary meetings and caucuses, will inevitably hold public office and strive for it; in short, women must enter the political arena. This result will be repulsive to a large portion of the sex, and would tend to make women unfeminine and combative, which would be a detriment to society.

It is well that men after the burden and heat of the day should return to homes where the quiet side of life is presented to them. In these peaceful New England homes of ours, great and noble men have been raised by wise and pious mothers, who instructed them, not in politics, but in those general principles of justice, integrity, and unselfishness, which belong to and will insure statesmanship in the men who are true to them. Here is the stronghold of the sex, weakest in body, powerful for good or evil over the stronger one, whom women sway and govern, not by the ballot and by greater numbers, but by those gentle influences designed by the Creator to soften and subdue man's ruder nature.

CLARA T. LEONARD.

---

#### THE LAW OF WOMAN LIFE.

The external arguments on both sides the modern woman question have been pretty thoroughly presented and well argued. It seems needless to repeat or recombining them; but in one relation they have scarcely been handled with any direct purpose. Justice and expediency have been the points insisted on or contested; these have not gone back far enough; they have not touched the central fact to set it forth in its force and finality. The fact is original and inherent, behind and at the root of the entire matter, with all its complication and circumstance. We have to ask a question to which it is the answer, and whose answer is that of the whole doubt and dispute.

What is the law of woman life?

What was she made woman for, and not man?

Shall we look back to that old third chapter of Genesis?

When mankind had taken the knowledge and power of good and evil into their own hands through the mere earthly wisdom of the serpent; when the woman had had her hasty outside way and lead, according to the story, and woe had come of it, what was the sentence? And was it a penance, or a setting right, or a promise, or all three?

The serpent was first dealt with. The narrow policy, the keen cunning, the little, immediate outlook, the expedient motive; all that was impersonated of temporary shift and outward prudence in mortal affairs, regardless of or blind to the everlasting issues; all, in short, that represented material and temporal interest as a rule and order—and is not man's external administration upon the earth largely forced to be a legislation upon these principles and economics—was disposed of with the few words, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman."

Was this punishment, as reflected upon the woman, or the power of a grand retrieval for her? Not to the man, who had been led, and who would be led again, by the woman, was the commission of holy revenge intrusted; but henceforth, "I will set the woman against thee." Against the very principle and live prompting of evil, or of mere earthly purpose and motive. "Between thy seed and her seed." Your struggle with her shall be in and for the very life of the race. "It," her life brought forth, "shall bruise thy head," thy whole power, and plan, and insidious cunning; "and thou shalt bruise," shalt sting, torment, hinder, and trouble in the way and daily going, "his heel," his footstep. Then, the subtle and creeping thing of the ground, shalt lurk after and threaten with crookedness and poison the ways of the men-children in their earth-toiling; the woman, the mother, shall turn upon thee for and in them, and shall beat thee down!

Unto the woman he said, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception." The burden and the glory are set in one. The pain of the world shall be in your heart; the trouble, the contradiction of it, shall be against your love and insight. But your pain shall be your power; you shall be the life-bearer; you shall hold the motive; yours shall be the *desire*, and your husband's the dominion. Therefore shall you bring your aspiration to him, that he may fulfill it for you. "Your desire shall be unto him, and he shall rule."

And unto Adam he said, "Because thou has hearkened unto the voice of thy wife," yes, and because thou *wilt* hearken, "thy sorrow shall be in the labor of the earth; the ground shall be cursed;" in all material things shall be cross and trouble, not against you, but "for your sake." "In your sorrow you shall eat of it all the days of your life." Your need and struggle shall be with external things, and with the ruling of them. "For your sake," that you may learn your mastery, inherit your true power, carry out with ease and understanding the desire and need of the race, which woman represents, discerns afar, and pleads to you.

And Adam bowed before the Lord's judgment; we are not told that he answered anything to that; but he turned to his wife, and in that moment "called her name Eve, because she was the mother of all living." Then and there was the division made, and to which can we say was the empire given? Both were set in conditions, hemmed in to divine and special work—man, by the stress and sorrow of the ground; woman by the stress and sorrow of her maternity and of her *spiritual conception*, making her truly the "mother of all living."

At the beginning of human history or tradition, then, we get the answer to our question: The law of woman life is central, interior, and from the heart of things; the law of the man's life is circumferential, enfolding, shaping, bearing on and around outwardly; wheel within wheel is the constitution of human power. It will be an evil day for the world when the nave shall leave its place and contend for that of the felloe. Iron-rimmed for its busy revolution and outward contact is the life and strength of man; but the tempered steel is at the heart and within the soul of the woman, that she may bear the silent pressure of the axle, and quietly and invisibly originate and support the entire onward movement. "The spirit of the living creature is in the wheels," and they can move no otherwise. "When the living creatures went, the wheels went by them; and when the living creatures were lifted up from the earth, the wheels were lifted up." That was what Ezekiel saw in his vision. There can be no going forward without a life and presence and impulse at the center; and in the organization of humanity there is where the place and power of woman have been put. For good or for evil, for the serpent or for the redeeming Christ, she must move, must influence, must achieve beforehand, and at the heart; she must be the mother of the race; she must be the mother of the Messiah. Not woman in her own person, but "one born of woman" is the Saviour. For everything that is formed of the Creator from the unorganized stone to the thought of righteousness in the heart of the race there must be a matrix. In the creation and in the recreation of his human child God makes woman and the soul of woman his blessed organ and instrument. When woman clears herself of her own perversions, her self-imposed limitations, returns to her spiritual power and place, and cries, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word," then shall the spirit descend unto her; then shall come the redemption.

Take this for the starting-point; it is the key.

Within, behind, antecedent to all result in action, are the place and office of the woman by the law of woman-life. And all question of her deed and duty should be brought to this test. Is it of her own interior natural relation, putting her at her true advantage, harmonious with the key to which her life is set? I think this suffrage question must settle itself precisely upon this ground principle, and that all argument should range conclusively around it. Judging so, we should find, I think, that not at the polls, where the last utterance of a people's voice is given—where the results of character and conscience and intelligence are shown—is her best and rightful work; on the contrary, that it is useless here, unless first done elsewhere. But where little children learn to think and speak—where men love and listen and the word is forming—is the office she has to fill, the errand she has to do. The question is, can she do both? Is there need that she should do both? Does not the former and greater include the later and less?

Hers are indeed the primary meetings: in her nursery, her home, and social circles; with other women, with young men, upon whose tone and character in her maturity her womanhood and motherhood join their beautiful and mighty influence; above all, among young girls—the "little women," to whom the ensign and commission are descending—is her undisputed power. Purify politics? Purify the sewers? But what if, first, the springs, and reservoirs, and conduits could be watched, guarded, filtered, and then the using be made clean and careful all through the homes; a better system devised and carried out for separating, neutralizing, destroying hurtful refuse? Then the poisonous gases might not be creeping back upon us through our enforced economies, our make-shifts and stop-gaps of outside legislation; for legislation is, after all, but cut-off, curb, and patch; an external, troublesome, partial, uncertain application of hindrance and remedy. What physician will work with lotion and plaster when he can touch, and control, and heal at the very seat of the disease?

It is the beginning of the fulfillment that women have waked to the consciousness that they have not as yet filled their full place in human life and affairs. Only has not the mistake been made of contending with and grappling results when causes



were in their hands? Have they not let go the mainsprings, to run after and ineffectually push with pins the refractory cogs upon the wheel-rims?

Woman always deserts herself when she puts her life and motive and influence in mere outsides. Outside of fashion and place, outside of charm and apparel, outside of work and ambition—she must learn that these are not her true showings; she must go back and put herself where God has called her to be with himself, at the silent, holy inmost; then we shall feel, if not at once, yet surely soon or sometime, a new order beginning. He, the Father of all, gives it to us to be the motherhood. That is the great solving and upraising word; not limited to mere parentage, but the law of woman-life. For good or for evil she mothers the world. Not all are called to motherhood in the literal sense, but all are called to the great, true motherhood in some of its manifold trusts and obligations. "*Noblesse oblige*;" you can not lay it down. "More are the children of the desolate than of her who hath a husband." All the little children that are born must look to womanhood somewhere for mothering. Do they all get it? All the works and policies of men look back somewhere for a true "desire" toward and by which only they can rule. Is the desire of the woman—of the home, the mother-motive of the world and human living—kept in the integrity and beauty for which it was intrusted to her, that it might move the power of man to noble ends?

Do you ask the governing of the nation? You have the making of the nation. Would you choose your statesmen? First make your statesmen.

Indeed the whole cause on trial may be summarily ended by the proving of an alibi, an elsewhere of demand. Is woman needed at the caucuses, conventions, polls? She is needed, at the same time, elsewhere. Two years of time and strength, of thought and love, from some woman, are essential for every little human being, that he may even begin a life. When you remember that every man is once a little child, born of a woman, trained—or needing training—at a woman's hands; that of the little men, every one of whom takes and shapes his life so, come at length the hand for the helm, the voice for the law, and the arm to enforce the law—what do you want more for a woman's opportunity and control?

Which would you choose as a force, an advantage, in settling any question of public moment, or as touching your own private interest through the general management, the right to go upon election day and cast one vote, or a hold beforehand upon the individual ear and attention of each voter now qualified? The ability to present to him your argument, to show him the real point at issue, to convince and persuade him of the right and lasting, instead of the weak and briefly politic way? This initial privilege is in the hands of woman, assuming that she can be brought to feel and act as a unit, which appears to be what is claimed for her in the argument for her regeneration of the outer political world. But already and separately, if every intelligent, conscientious woman can but reach one man, and influence him from the principle involved—from her interior perception of it, kept pure on purpose from bias and temptation that assail him in the outside mix and jostle—will she not have done her work without the casting of a ballot? And what becomes of "taxation without representation," when, from Eden down, Eve can always plead with Adam, can have the first word instead of the last—if she knows what that first word is, in herself and thence in its power with him—can beguile him to his good instead of to his harm, as indeed she only meant to do in that first ignorant experiment? Would it be any less easy to qualify for and accomplish this than to convince and outnumber in public gatherings not only bodies of men but the mass of women that will also have to be confronted and convinced or overborne?

Preconceived opinions, minds made up, men not so easily beguiled to the pure good, you say? Woman quite as apt to make mistakes out of Paradise as in? That only returns us to the primal need and opportunity. Get the man to listen to you before his mind is made up, before his manhood is made up; while it is in the making. That is just the power and place that belong to you, and you must seize and fill. It is your natural right; God gave it to you. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head."

We can not do all in one day, and in such a day of the world as this. We plant trees for posterity, where forests have been laid waste, and the beautiful work of life is to be done over again; we can not expect to see our fruit in souls and in the nation at less cost of faith and time. Take care, then, of the little children—the men-children—to make men of them; the women-children—oh, yes, even above all—to make ready for future mothering; to snatch from the evil that works over against pure womanliness. Until you have done this let men fend for themselves in rough outsides a little longer; except, perhaps, as wise, able women whom the trying transition time calls forth may find fit way and place for effort and protest—there is always room for that, and noble work has been and is being done; but do not rear a new generation of women to expect and desire charges and responsibilities reverse of their own life-law, through whose perfect fulfillment alone may the future clean place be made for all to work in.

Is there excess of female population? Can not all expect the direct rule of a home? Is not this exactly, perhaps, just now, for the more universal remedial mothering that in this age is the thing immediately needed? Let her who has no child seek where she can help the burdened mother of many; how she can best reach with influence, and wisdom, and cherishing, the greatest number—or most efficiently a few—of these dear, helpless, terrible little souls, who are to make, in a few years, a new social condition; a better and higher, happier and safer, or a lower, worse, bitterer, more desperately complicated and distressful one.

"Desire earnestly the best gifts," said St. Paul, after enumerating the gifts of teaching, and prophecy and authority; "and I show you," he goes on, "a yet more excellent way." *Charity*, not mere alms, or toleration, or general benignity, out of a safe self-provision; but *caritas*, nearness, and caring, and loving, the very essence of mothering; the way to and hold of the heart of it all, the heart of the life of humanity. "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life." That is the first word; it charges womanhood itself, which must be set utterly right before it can take hold to right the world. Here are at once task, and mission, and rewarding sway.

Woman has got off the track; she must see that first, and replace herself. We are mothering the world still; but we are mothering it, in a fearfully wide measure, all wrong.

Sacrifice is the beginning of all redemption. We must give up. We must even give up the wish and seeming to have a hand in things, that we may work unseen in the elements, and make them fit and healthful; that daily bread and daily life may be sweet again in dear, old, homely ways, and plentiful with all truly blessed opportunities. We are not to organize the world, or to conquer it, or to queen it. We are just to take it again and mother it. If woman would begin that, search out the cradles of life and character, and take care of the whole world of fifty years hence, in taking care of them calling upon men and the State when needful to authorize her action and furnish outward means for it, I wonder what might come, as earnest of good, even in this our day, in which we know not our visitation.

And here again come allowance and exception for what women can always do when this world-mothering forces an appeal to the strength and authority of man. Women have never been prevented from doing their real errands in the world, even outside the domestic boundary. They have defended their husband's castles in the old chivalrous times, when the male chivalry was away at the crusades. They have headed armies when Heaven called them; only Heaven never called all the women at once; but when the king was crowned, the mission done, they have turned back with desire to their sheltered, gentle, unobtrusive life again. There has no business to be a standing army of women; not even a standing political army. Women have navigated and brought home ships when commanders have died or been stricken helpless upon the ocean; they have done true, intelligent, patient work for science, art, religion; and those have done the most who have never stopped to contend first, whether a woman, as such, may do it or not. Look at what Dorothea Dix has done, single-handed, single-mouthed, in asylums and before legislatures. Women have sat on thrones, and governed kingdoms well, when that was the station in life to which God called them. If Victoria of England has been anything she has been the mother of her land; she has been queen and protecting genius of its womanhood and homes. And when a woman does these things, as called of God, not talks of them, as to whether she may make claim to do them, she carries a weight from the very sanctity out of which she steps as woman, that moves men unlike the moving of any other power. Shall she resign the chance of doing really great things, of meeting grand crises, by making herself common in ward-rooms and at street-corners, and abolishing the perfect idea of home by no longer consecrating herself to it?

If individual woman, as has been said, may gain and influence individual man and so the man-power in affairs—a body of women, purely as such, with cause, and plea, and reason, can always have the ear and attention of bodies of men; but, to do this, they must come straight from their home sanctities, as representing them—as able to represent them otherwise than men, because of their hearth-priestesshood; not as politicians, bred and hardened in the public arenas.

That the family is the heart of the State, and that the State is but the widened family, is the fact which the old vestal consecration, power, and honor set forth and kept in mind.

The voice which has of late been so generally conceded to women in town decisions as regarding public schools, is an instance of the fittingness of relegating to them certain interests of which they should know more than men, because—applying the key-test with which we have started—it has direct relation to, and springs from, their motherhood. But can one help suggesting that if the movement had been to place women, merely and directly, upon the committees, by votes of men who saw that this work might be in great part best done by them; if women had asked and offered for the place without the jostle of the town-meeting, or putting



in that wedge for the ballot, the thing might have been as readily done, and the objection, or political precedent, avoided?

It is not the real opportunity, when that arises or shows itself in the line of her life-law, that is to be refused for woman. It is the taking from internal power to add to external complication of machinery and to the friction of strife. Let us just touch upon some of the current arguments concerning these external impositions which one set is demanding and the other entreating against.

If voting is to be the chief power in woman's hands, or even a power of half the moment that is contended for it, it will grow to be the motive and end, the all-absorbing object, with women that it is with men.

The gubernatorial canvass, the Presidential year—these will interrupt and clog all home business, suspend decisions, paralyze plans, as they do with men, or else we shall not be much, as thorough politicians, after all. And if we talk of mending all that—of putting politics in their right place, and governing by pure principle instead of party trick and stumping and electioneering—we go back in effect to the acknowledgment that only in the interior work, and behind politics, can women do better things at all; which, precisely, was to be demonstrated.

Think, simply, of election day for women.

Would it be so invariably easy a thing for a home-keeper to do, at the one opportunity of the year, or the four years, on a particular day, her duty in this matter? It is easy to say that it takes no more time than a hundred other things that some do; but setting apart all the argument that previous time and strength must have been spent in properly qualifying, how many of the hundred other things are done now without interruption, postponement, hinderance, through domestic contingencies? or are there a hundred other things done when the home contingencies are really met by a woman? A woman's life is not like a man's. That a man's life *may be*—that he may transact his out-door business; keep his hours and appointments; may cast his vote on election day; may represent wife and children in all wherein the community cares for, or might injure him and them—the woman, some woman, must be at the home post, that the home order may go on, from which he derives that command of time and freedom from hindering necessities, which leave him to his work. And so, as the old proverb says, while man's work is from sun to sun—made definite, a matter to which he can go forth and from which he can come in—a woman's work, of keeping the place of the forth-going and incoming, is never done, from the very nature and ceaseless importance of it.

Must she go to the polls, sick or well, baby or no baby, servant or no servant, strength or no strength, desire or no desire? If she have cook and housemaid they are to go also, and number her two to one, any way; probably on election day, which they would make a holiday, they would—as at other crises, of birth, sickness, death, house-cleaning, which should occur in no first-class families—come down upon her with their appropriate *coup d'état*, and “leave;” making the state-stroke, in this instance, of scoring three votes, two dropped and one lost, for the irrepressible side.

How will it be when Norah and Maggie and Katie have not only their mass and confession, their Fourth-of-July and Christmas, their mission weeks, their social engagements and family plans, and their appointments with their dress-makers, to curtail your claims upon their bargained time and service, but their share in the primary meetings and caucuses, committees and torch-light processions and mass meetings? For what shall prevent the excitements, the pleasuring, the runnings hither and thither that men delight in from following in the train of politics and parties with the common woman? Perhaps it may even be discovered, to the still further detriment of our already painfully-hampered and perplexed domestic system that the pursuit of fun, votes, offices is more remunerative, as well as gentlewomanly—as Micawber might express it—than the cleansing of pots and pans, the weekly wash, or the watching of the roast. Perhaps in that enfranchised day there will be no Katis and Maggies, and the Norahs will know their place no more.

Then the enlightened womanhood may have to begin at the foundation, and glorify the kitchen again. And good enough for her, in the wide as well as primitive sense of the phrase, and a grand turn in the history that repeats itself toward the old, forgotten, peaceful side of the cycle it may be!

But the argument does not rest upon any such points as these. It rests upon the inside nature of a woman's work; upon the need there is to begin again to-day at the heart of things and make that right; upon the evident fact that this can be done none too soon or earnestly, if the community and the country are not to keep on in the broad way to a threatened destruction; and upon the certainty that it can never be done unless it is done by woman, and with all of woman's might. Not by struggles for new and different place, but by the better, more loving, more intelligent deep-seeing and deep-feeling filling of her own place, that none will dispute and none can take from her. We are not where woman was in the old brutal days that are so often quoted; and we shall not, need not, return to that. Christianity has disposed of that sort of argument. We are on a vantage ground for the doing of our real essential

work better than it has been done ever before in the history of the world; and we are madly leaving our work and our vantage together. The great step made by woman was in the generation preceding this one of restlessness—the restlessness that has come through the first feeling of great power. It was made in the time when women learned physiology, that they might rear and nurse their families and help their neighborhoods understandingly; science, that they might teach and answer little children, and share the joy of knowledge that was spreading swiftly in the earth; political history and economy, that they might listen and talk to their brothers and husbands and sons, and leaven the life of the age as the bread in the mixing; business, figures, rules, and principles, that they might sympathize, counsel, help, and prudentially work with and honestly strengthen the bread-winners. The good work was begun in the schools where girls were first told, as George B. Emerson used to tell us Boston girls, that we were learning everything he could teach us, in order to be women, wives, mothers, friends, social influencers, in the best and largest way possible. Women grew strong and capable under such instruction and motive. Are their daughters and granddaughters about to leap the fence, leave their own realm little cared for—or doomed to be—undertake the whole scheme of outside creation, or contest it with the men? Then God help the men! God save the Commonwealth!

We are past the point already where homes are suffering, or liable to suffer, neglect or injury; they are already *left unmade*. Shall this go on? Between frivolities and ambitions, between social vanities, and shows, and public meddlings and mixings—for where one woman is needed and doing really brave, true work, there are a hundred rushing forth for the mere sake of rushing—is the primitive home, the power of heaven upon earth, to slip away from among us? Let us not build outsides which have no insides; let us not put a face upon things which has no reality behind it. Beware lest we make the confusion that we need the suffrage to help us unmake; lest we tear to pieces that we may patch again. Crazy patchwork that would be, indeed!

Are women's votes required because men will not legislate away evils that they do not heartily wish away? Is government corrupted because men desire shield and opportunity for dishonest speculation, authority and countenance for nefarious combinations? The more need to go to work at the beginning rather than to plunge into the pitch and be defiled; more need to make haste and educate a better generation of men, if it be so we can not, except *vi et armis*, influence the generation that is.

But do you think that if women are in earnest—enough in earnest to give up, as they seem to be to demand—they might not bring their real power to bear even upon these evil things, in their root and inception, and even now? Suppose women would not live in houses, or wear jewels and gowns, that are bought for them out of wicked millions made upon the stock exchange? Suppose they would stop decorating their dwellings in an agony, crowding them hurriedly with this and that of the last and newest, just because it is last and new, making as how and rivalry of what is not a true-grown beauty of a home at all, but a mere meretriciousness; suppose they would so set to work and change society that displays and feastings, which use up at every separate one a year's comfortable support for a quiet, modest family, should be given up as vulgarities; that people should care for, and be ready for, a true interchange of life and thought, and simple, uncrowded opportunities for these. Suppose women would say, "No; I will not blaze at Newport, or run through Europe dropping American eagles on English sovereigns after me like the trail of a comet, or the crumbs that Hop-o'-my thumb let fall from his pocket that the people at home might track the way he had gone; because, if I have money, there is better work to be done with it; and I will not have the money that is made by gambling manipulations and cheats." Do you think this would have no influence? More than that, and further back, and lowlier down, suppose they should say, every one, "I will not have the new, convenient house, the fresh carpetings, the pretty curtains, or even the least, most fitting freshness, until I know the means are earned for me with honest service to the world, and by no lucky turn of even a small speculation." Further back yet, suppose them to declare, "I will not have the home at all, nor my own happiness, unless it can be based and builded on the kind of life-work that helps to make a real prosperity; that really goes to the building and safe-keeping of a whole nation of such homes." Would there be no power in that? Would it not be a kind of woman-suffrage to settle the very initials of all that ever bears upon the public question? And to bring that sort of woman on the stage, and to the front, is there not enough work to do, and enough "higher education" to insist on and secure?

After all, men work for women; or, if they think they don't, it would leave them but sorry satisfaction to abandon them to such existence as they could arrange without us. In blessed homes, or in scattered dissipations of show, amusement, or the worse which these shows and amusements are but terribly akin to, women give purpose to and direct the results of all men's work. If the false standards of living first urge them, until at length the horrible intoxication of the game itself drives them on further and deeper, are we less responsible for the last state of those men than for the first?



Do you say, if good women refuse these things and tried for a simpler and truer living, there are plenty of bad ones who would take them anyhow, and supply the motive to deeper and more unmitigated evil? Ah, there come both answer and errand again. Raise the fallen—at least save the growing womanhood—stop the destruction that rushes accelerating on, before you challenge new difficulty and danger with an indiscriminate franchise. Are not these bad women the very "plenty" that would out-balance you at the polls, if you persist in trying the "patch-and-plaster" remedy of suffrage and legislation?

Recognize the fact, the law, that your power, your high commission, is inward—vital—formative and causal. Bring all question of choice or duty to this test: Will it work at the heart of things, among the realities and forces? Try your own life by this; remember that mere external is falsehood and death. The letter killeth. Give up all that is only of the appearance—or even chiefly so, in conscious delight and motive—in person, surrounding, pursuit. Let yourself-presentation, your home-making and adorning, our social effort and interest, your occupation and use of talent, all shape and issue for the things that are essentially and integrally good, and that the world needs to have prevail. Until you can do this, and induce such doing, it is of little use to clamor for mere outward right, or to contend that it would be rightly applied.

Work as you will, and widely as you can, for schools, in associations, in everything whose end is to teach, enlighten, enlarge women, and so the world. Help and protect the industries of women; but keep those industries within the guiding law of woman-life. Do not throw down barriers that take down safeguards with them; that make threatening breaches in the very social structure. If women must serve in shops, demand and care for it that it shall be in a less mixed, a more shielded way than now. The great caravansaries of trade are perilous by their throng, publicity, and weariness. There used to be women's shops—choice places, where a woman's care and taste had ruled before the counters were spread; where women could quietly purchase things that were sure to be beautiful or of good service; there were not the tumult and ransacking that kill both shop-girl and shopper now. This is one instance, and but one, of the resewing that ought to be attempted. There ought at least to be distinct women's departments, presided over by women of good, motherly tone and character, in the places of business which women so frequent, and where the thoughtful are aware of much that makes them tremble. And surely a great many of the girls and women who choose shop work, because they like its excitement, ought rather to be in homes, rendering womanly service, and preparing to serve in homes of their own—leaving their present places to young men who might perhaps begin so to earn the homes to offer them. Will not this apply all the way up, into the arts and the professions even? There must needs be exceptional women perhaps; there are, and will be, time and errand and place for them; but Heaven forbid that they should all become exceptional!

Once more, work for these things that are behind, and underlie; believing that woman's place is behind and within, not of repression, but of power; and that if she do not fill this place it will be empty; there will be no main-spring. Meanwhile she will get her rights as she rises to them, and her defenses where she needs them; everything that helps, defends, uplifts the woman uplifts man and the whole fabric, and man has begun to find it out. If he "will give the suffrage if women want it," as is said, why shall he not as well give them the things that they want suffrage for, and that they are capable of representing? Believe me, this work, and the representation which grows out of it, can no longer be done if we attempt the handling of political machinery—the making of platforms, the judging of candidates, the measuring and disputation of party plans and issues, and all the tortuous following up of public and personal political history. Do you say men have their individual work in the world, and all this beside and of it, and that therefore we may? Exactly here comes in again the law of the interior. Their work is "of it"—falls in the way. They rub against it as they go along. Men meet each other in the business thoroughfares, at the offices, and the street corners; we are in the dear depths of home. We are with the little ones, of whom is not this kingdom, but the kingdom of heaven, which we, through them, may help to come. This is just where we must abandon our work, if we attempt the doing of theirs. And here is where our prestige will desert us, whenever great cause calls us to speak from out our seclusions, and show men, from our insights and our place, the occasion and desire that look unto their rule. They will not listen then; they will remand us to the ballot-box.

"Inside politics" is a good word. That is just where woman ought to be, as she ought to be inside everything; insisting upon and implanting the truth and right that are to conquer. And she can not be inside and outside both. She can not do the mothering and the home-making, the watching and ministry, the earning and maintaining hold and privilege and motive influence behind and through the acts of men, and all the world-wide execution of act beside. Therefore we say, do not give up the substance which you might seize, for the shadow which you could not hold fast

if you were to seem to grasp it. Work on at the foundations. Insist on truth and right; put them into all your own life, taking all the beam out of your own eye before demanding—well, we will say the *mote*, for generosity's sake, and for the holy authority of the word—out of the brother's eyes. Establish pure, honest, lovely things—things of good report—in the nurseries, the schools, the social circles where you reign and the outside world, and issue will take form and heed for themselves. The nation, of which the family is the root, will be made and built and saved accordingly. Every seed hath its own body. The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent-head of evil, and shall rise triumphant to become the ennobled, recreated commonwealth. Then shall pour forth the double pæan that thrills through the glorious final chorus of Schumann's *Faust*—men and women answering in antiphons—

The indescribable,  
Here it is done;  
The ever-womanly  
Beckons us on!

Then shall Mary—the fulfilled, ennobled womanhood—sing her Magnificat; standing to receive from the Lord, and to give the living word to the nations—

My soul doth magnify the Lord,  
And my spirit hath rejoiced in God, my Savior.  
For He hath looked upon the low estate of His handmaiden:  
For behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.  
For He that is mighty hath done to me great things;  
And holy is His name.  
And His mercy is unto generations and generations.

The coming new version of the Old Testament gives us, we are told, among other more perfect renderings, this one, which fitly utters charge and promise:

The Lord gave the word;  
Great was the company  
Of those  
That published it.

The Lord giveth the word;  
And the women that bring  
Glad tidings  
Are a great host.

ADELINE D. T. WHITNEY.

The minority of the committee ask special attention to "Some of the Reasons against Woman Suffrage, by Francis Parkman, printed at the request of an association of women," which are as follows:

#### SOME OF THE REASONS AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

##### THE POWER OF SEX.

It has been said that the question of the rights and employment of women should be treated without regard to sex. It should rather be said that those who consider it regardless of sex do not consider it at all. It will not do to exclude from the problem the chief factor in it, and deal with women only as if they were smaller and weaker men. Yet these have been the tactics of the agitators for female suffrage, and to them they mainly owe what success they have had. Hence their extreme sensitiveness whenever the subject is approached on its most essential side. If it could be treated like other subjects, and discussed fully and freely, the cause of the self-styled reformers would have been hopeless from the first. It is happy for them that the relations of women to society can not be so discussed without giving just offense. Their most important considerations can be touched but slightly; and even then offense will be taken.

Whatever liberty the best civilization may accord to women, they must always be subject to restrictions unknown to the other sex, and they can never dispense with the protecting influences which society throws about them. A man, in lonely places, has nothing to lose but life and property; and he has nerve and muscles to defend them. He is free to go whither he pleases, and run what risks he pleases. Without a radical change in human nature, of which the world has never given the faintest sign, women can not be equally emancipated. It is not a question of custom, habit, or public opinion, but of an all-pervading force, always formidable in the vast number of men in whom it is not controlled by higher forces. A woman is subject, also, to many other restrictions, more or less stringent, necessary to the maintenance of self respect and the respect of others, and yet placing her at a disadvantage, as compared to men, in the active work of the world. All this is mere truism, but the plainest truism may be ignored in the interest of a theory or a "cause."

Again, everybody knows that the physical and mental constitution of woman is more delicate than in the other sex; and, we may add, the relations between mind and body are more intimate and subtle. It is true that they are abundantly so in



men; but their harder organism is neither so sensitive to disturbing influences nor subject to so many of them.

It is these and other inherent conditions, joined to the engrossing nature of a woman's special functions, that have determined through all time her relative position. What we have just said—and we might have said much more—is meant as a reminder that her greatest limitations are not of human origin. Men did not make them, and they can not unmake them. Through them God and Nature have ordained that those subject to them shall not be forced to join in the harsh conflicts of the world militant. It is folly to ignore them, or try to counteract them by political and social quackery. They set at naught legislatures and peoples.

#### SELF-COMPLACENCY OF THE AGITATORS.

Here we may notice an idea which seems to prevail among the woman suffragists, that they have argued away the causes which have always determined the substantial relations of the sexes. This notion arises mainly from the fact that they have had the debate very much to themselves. Their case is that of the self-made philosopher who attacked the theory of gravitation, and, because nobody took the trouble to answer him, boasted that he had demolished it, and called it an error of the past.

#### CRUELTY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The frequent low state of health among American women is a fact as undeniable as it is deplorable.

In this condition of things, what do certain women demand for the good of their sex? To add to the excitements that are wasting them other and greater excitements, and to cares too much for their strength other and greater cares. Because they can not do their own work, to require them to add to it the work of men, and launch them into the turmoil where the most robust sometimes fail. It is much as if a man in a state of nervous exhaustion were told by his physician to enter at once for a foot-race or a boxing-match.

#### POWER SHOULD GO WITH RESPONSIBILITY.

To hold the man responsible and yet deprive him of power is neither just nor rational. The man is the natural head of the family, and is responsible for its maintenance and order. Hence he ought to control the social and business agencies which are essential to the successful discharge of the trust imposed upon him. If he is deprived of any part of this control, he should be freed also in the same measure from the responsibilities attached to it.

#### ALTERNATIVES OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Woman suffrage must have one of two effects. If, as many of its advocates complain, women are subservient to men, and do nothing but what they desire, then woman suffrage will have no other result than to increase the power of the other sex; if, on the other hand, women vote as they see fit, without regarding their husbands, then unhappy marriages will be multiplied and divorces redoubled. We can not afford to add to the elements of domestic unhappiness.

#### POLITICAL DANGERS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

One of the chief dangers of popular government is that of inconsiderate and rash legislation. In impatience to be rid of one evil, ulterior consequences are apt to be forgotten. In the haste to redress one wrong, a door may be opened to many. This danger would be increased immeasurably if the most impulsive and excitable half of humanity had an equal voice in the making of laws, and in the administration of them. Abstract right would then be made to prevail after a fashion somewhat startling. A lady of intelligence and admirable intentions, an ardent partisan on principles of pure humanitarianism, confessed that, in the last Presidential election, Florida had given a majority for the Democrats; but insisted that it was right to count it for Hayes, because other States had been counted wrongfully for Tilden. It was impossible to make her comprehend that government conducted on such principles would end in anarchy. In politics, the virtues of women would sometimes be as dangerous as their faults.

If the better class of women flatter themselves that they can control the others, they are doomed to disappointment. They will be outvoted in their own kitchens, without reckoning the agglomerations of poverty, ignorance, and vice, that form a

startling proportion of our city populations. It is here that the male vote alone threatens our system with its darkest perils. The female vote would enormously increase the evil, for it is often more numerous, always more impulsive and less subject to reason, and almost devoid of the sense of responsibility. Here the bad politician would find his richest resources. He could not reach the better class of female voters, but the rest would be ready to his hand. Three-fourths of them, when not urged by some pressing need or contagious passion, would be moved, not by principles, but by personal predilections.

#### THE FEMALE POLITICIAN.

It is not woman's virtues that would be prominent or influential in the political arena. They would shun it by an invincible repulsion; and the opposite qualities would be drawn into it. The Washington lobby has given us some means of judging what we may expect from the woman "inside politics." If politics are to be purified by artfulness, effrontery, insensibility, a pushing self-assertion, and a glib tongue, then we may look for regeneration; for the typical female politician will be richly endowed with all these gifts.

Thus accoutered for the conflict, she may fairly hope to have the better of her masculine antagonist. A woman has the inalienable right of attacking without being attacked in turn. She may strike, but must not be struck, either literally or figuratively. Most women refrain from abusing their privilege of non-combatants; but there are those in whom the sense of impunity breeds the cowardly courage of the virago.

In reckoning the resources of the female politicians there is one which can by no means be left out. None know better than women the potency of feminine charms aided by feminine arts. The woman "inside politics" will not fail to make use of an influence so subtle and strong, and of which the management is peculiarly suited to her talents. If—and the contingency is in the highest degree probable—she is not gifted with charms of her own, she will have no difficulty in finding and using others of her sex who are. If report is to be trusted, Delilah has already spread her snares for the Congressional Samson; and the power before which the wise fail and the mighty fall has been invoked against the sages and heroes of the Capitol. When "woman" is fairly "inside politics," the sensation press will reap a harvest of scandals more lucrative to itself than profitable to public morals. And, as the zeal of one class of female reformers has been, and no doubt will be, largely directed to their grievances in matters of sex, we shall have shrill-tongued discussions of subjects which had far better be let alone.

It may be said that the advocates of female suffrage do not look to political women for the purifying of politics, but to the votes of the sex at large. The two, however, can not be separated. It should be remembered that the question is not of a limited and select female suffrage, but of a universal one. To limit would be impossible. It would seek the broadest areas and the lowest depths, and spread itself through the marshes and malarious pools of society.

#### MEN WILL GIVE WOMEN THE SUFFRAGE IF THEY WANT IT.

Again, one of the chief arguments of the agitators is that government without the consent of the governed is opposed to inalienable right. But most women, including those of the best capacity and worth, fully consent that their fathers, husbands, brothers, or friends shall be their political representatives; and no exhortation or teasing has induced them to withhold their consent. Nor is this surprising; for a woman is generally represented in a far truer and more intimate sense by her male relative than is this relative by the candidate to whom he gives his vote, commonly without knowing him, and often with dissent from many of his views.

Nothing is more certain than that women will have the suffrage if they ever want it; for when they want it, men will give it to them, regardless of consequences. A more than readiness on the part of men to conform to the wishes of the other sex is a national trait in America, though whether it would survive the advent of the female politician is matter for reflection. We venture to remind those who demand woman suffrage as a right that, even if it were so, the great majority of intelligent women could judge for themselves whether to exercise it, better than the few who assume to teach them their duty.

#### MOST WOMEN AVERSE TO IT.

The agitators know well that, in spite of their persistent importunity, the majority of women are averse to the suffrage. Hence, the ludicrous terror which the suffragists showed at the governor's proposal to submit the question to a vote of the women of the State.



THE WOMAN SUFFRAGISTS HAVE DONE NOTHING TO PROVE THEIR FITNESS FOR A SHARE IN GOVERNMENT.

A small number of women have spent their time for several decades in ceaseless demands for suffrage, but they have lost their best argument in failing to show that they are prepared to use the franchise when they have got it. A single sound and useful contribution to one side or the other of any question of current politics—the tariff, specie payments, the silver bill, civil-service reform, railroad monopoly, capital and labor, or a half score of other matters—would have done more for their cause than years of empty agitation.

PERMANENCE OF THE RELATIONS OF THE SEXES.

The agitators say that no reason can be given why women should not take a direct part in politics, except that they have never done so. There are other reasons, and strong ones, in abundance. But this particular one is nevertheless good.

All usages, laws, and institutions have risen and perished, and risen and perished again. Their history is the history of mutability itself. But, from the earliest records of mankind down to this moment, in every race and every form or degree of civilization or barbarism, the relative position of the sexes has been essentially the same, with exceptions so feeble, rare, and transient that they only prove the rule. Such permanence in the foundation of society, while all that rests upon it has passed from change to change, is proof in itself that this foundation lies deep in the essential nature of things. It is idle to prate of the old time that has passed away and the new time that is coming. The "new time" can no more stir the basis of human nature than it can stop the movement of the earth.

The cause of this permanence is obvious. Women have great special tasks assigned them in the work of life, and men have not. To these tasks their whole nature, moral and physical, is adjusted. There is scarcely a distinctive quality of women that has not a direct or indirect bearing upon them. Everything else in their existence is subordinated to the indispensable functions of continuing and rearing the human race; and, during the best years of life, this work, fully discharged, leaves little room for any other. Rightly considered, it is a work no less dignified than essential. It is the root and stem of national existence, while the occupations of men are but the leaves and branches. On women of the intelligent and instructed classes depends the future of the nation. If they are sound in body and mind, impart this soundness to a numerous offspring, and rear them to a sense of responsibility and duty, there are no national evils that we can not overcome. If they fail to do this their part, then the masses of the coarse and unintelligent, always of rapid increase, will overwhelm us and our institutions. When these indispensable duties are fully discharged, then the suffrage agitators may ask with better grace, if not with more reason, that they may share the political functions of men.

IS WOMAN SUFFRAGE A RIGHT OR A WRONG?

It has been claimed as a right that woman should vote. It is no right, but a wrong that a small number of women should impose on all the rest political duties which there is no call for their assuming, which they do not want to assume, and which, if duly discharged, would be a cruel and intolerable burden. This pretense of the female suffragists was reduced to an absurdity when some of them gravely affirmed that if a single woman wanted to vote all the others ought to be required to do so.

Government by doctrines of abstract right, of which the French revolution set the example and bore the fruits, involves enormous danger and injustice. No political right is absolute and of universal application. Each has its conditions, qualifications, and limitations. If these are disregarded, one right collides with another, or with many others. Even a man's right to liberty is subject to the condition that he does not use it to infringe the rights of his neighbors. It is in the concrete, and not in the abstract, that rights prevail in every sound and wholesome society. They are applied where they are applicable. A government of glittering generalities quickly destroys itself. The object of government is the accomplishment of a certain result, the greatest good of the governed; and the ways of reaching it vary in different countries and different social conditions. Neither liberty nor the suffrage are the end; they are nothing but means to reach it; and each should be used to the extent in which it is best adapted to its purpose. If the voting of women conduces to the greatest good of the community then they ought to vote, and otherwise they ought not. The question of female suffrage thus becomes a practical question, and not one of declamation.

What would be the results of the general application of the so-called right to vote, a right which, if it exists at all, must be common to all mankind? Suppose that the

populations of Turkey, the Soudan, or Zululand, were to attempt to exercise it and govern themselves by universal popular suffrage.

The consequence would be anarchy and a quick return to despotism as a relief. The same would be the case, in less degree, among peoples more civilized, yet not trained to self-government by the habits and experience of generations. In fact, there are but a few of the most advanced nations in whom the universal exercise of the pretended "inalienable right" to vote would not produce political and social convulsions. The truth is this: If the exercise of the suffrage by any individual or body of individuals involves detriment to the whole people, then the right to exercise it does not exist.

It is the right and the duty of the people to provide itself with good government, and this great practical right and duty is imperative and paramount; whatever conflicts with it must give way. The air-blown theory of inalienable right is unworthy the good sense of the American people.

The most rational even of the suffragists themselves have ceased to rely on it.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE NOT PROGRESS.

Many women of sense and intelligence are influenced by the fact that the woman-suffrage movement boasts itself a movement of progress, and by a wish to be on the liberal or progressive side. But the boast is unfounded. Progress, to be genuine, must be in accord with natural law. If it is not it ends in failure and in retrogression. To give women a thorough and wholesome training both of body and mind; to prepare such of them as have strength and opportunity for various occupations different from what they usually exercise, and above all for the practice of medicine, in which we believe that they may render valuable service; to rear them in more serious views of life and its responsibilities are all in the way of normal and healthy development; but to plunge them into politics, where they are not needed and for which they are unfit, would be scarcely more a movement of progress than to force them to bear arms and fight.

#### WOMAN IN POLITICS AN ANTIQUATED IDEA.

The social power of women has grown with the growth of civilization, but their political power has diminished. In former times and under low social conditions, women have occasionally had a degree of power in public affairs unknown in the foremost nations of the modern world. The most savage tribes on this continent, the Six Nations of New York, listened in solemn assembly to the counsels of its matrons with a deference that has no parallel among its civilized successors. The people of ancient Lycia, at a time when they were semi-barbarians, gave such power to their women that they were reported to live under a gynocracy, or female government. The word gynocracy, by the way, belongs to antiquity. It has no application in modern life; and, in the past, its applications were found, not in the higher developments of ancient society, but in the lower. Four hundred years before Christ the question of giving political power to women was agitated among the most civilized of ancient people, the Athenians, and they would not follow the example of their barbarian neighbors.

#### THE CONNECTION BETWEEN VOTING AND FIGHTING.

The advocates of woman suffrage have ridiculed the idea of any connection between voting and the capacity to fight. Their attitude in this matter shows the absence of reflection on questions of government, or the inability to form rational judgment upon them. In fact, it is with nearly all of them a matter, not of reason, but of sentiment.

The human race consists of two equal parts, the combatant and the non-combatant, and these parts are separated by the line of sex. It is true that some men are permanently disabled from fighting, and others may be disabled in one year or one month, and fit to bear arms in the next, but the general fact remains that men are the fighting half of humanity, and women are not. Fundamental laws are made in reference to aggregates of persons, and not to individual exceptions; and it would be absurd to exact a surgeon's certificate of military competency from every voter at the polls. It is enough that he belongs to a body which, as a whole, can and will fight. The question remains, what has this to do with voting? It has a great deal to do with it, and above all in a government purely popular.

#### THE VOTING OF A LARGE NON-COMBATANT CLASS DANGEROUS TO CIVIL HARMONY.

Since history began, no government ever sustained itself long unless it could command the physical force of the nation; and this, whether the form of government was despotism, constitutional monarchy, or democracy. The despot controls the army



which compels the people to obey; the king and parliament control the force of the kingdom, and malcontents dare not rise in insurrection till they think they have drawn away an equal or greater share of it. Finally, the majority in a democratic republic feels secure that its enactments will take effect, because the defeated minority, even if it does not respect law, will respect a force greater than its own. But suppose the majority to consist chiefly of women. Then legality would be on one side and power on the other. The majority would have the law, and the minority the courage and strength. Hence, in times of political excitement, when passions were roused and great interests were at stake, the majority, that is, the legal authority, would need the help of a standing army. Without such support the possession of the suffrage by the non-combatant half of the nation would greatly increase the chances of civil discord. Once in our history a minority rose against the majority, in the belief that it could out-fight it. This would happen often if the minority, as in the supposed case of woman suffrage, had not only the belief, but the certainty, that it could master the majority. It may not be creditable to human nature that if we would have a stable government it is necessary to keep the balance of power on the side of law; but the business of government is to shape itself to the actual, and not the ideal or millennial, condition of mankind.

Suppose, again, a foreign war in which the sympathies of our women were enlisted on one side or the other. Suppose them to vote against the judgment of the men that we should take part in it, or, in other words, that their male fellow-citizens should fight whether they liked it or not. Would the men be likely to obey?

#### ANOTHER SOURCE OF DISCORD.

There is another reason why the giving of the suffrage to women would tend to civil discord. In the politics of the future the predominant, if not the engrossing, questions will be to all appearance those of finance and the relations of labor and capital. From the nature of their occupations, as well as other causes, women in general are ignorant of these matters, and not well fitted to deal with them. They require an experience, a careful attention, a deliberation and coolness of judgment, and a freedom from passion, so rare that at the best their political treatment is full of difficulty and danger. If these qualities are rare in men, they are still more so in women, and feminine instinct will not in the present case supply their place. The peculiar danger of these questions is that they raise class animosities, and tend to set the poor against the rich and the rich against the poor. They become questions of social antagonism. Now, most of us have had occasion to observe how strong the social rivalries and animosities of women are. They far exceed those of men. If, in the strife between labor and capital, which, without great self-restraint on both sides, is likely to be a fierce one, women should be called to an active part, the effect would be like throwing pitch and resin into the fire. The wives and daughters of the poor would bring into the contest a wrathful jealousy and hate against the wives and daughters of the rich far more vehement than the corresponding passions in their husbands and brothers.

#### PRACTICAL VERSUS SENTIMENTAL GOVERNMENT.

The real issue is this: Is the object of government the good of the governed, or is it not? A late writer on woman suffrage says that it is not. According to her, the object of government is to give his or her rights to everybody. Others among the agitators do not venture either on this flat denial or this brave assertion, but only hover about them with longing looks. Virtually they maintain that the object of government is the realization of certain ideas or theories. They believe in principles, and so do we; they believe in rights, and so do we. But as the sublime may pass into the ridiculous, so the best principles may be transported into regions of folly or diabolism. There are minds so constituted that they can never stop till they have run every virtue into its correlative weakness or vice. Government should be guided by principles; but they should be sane and not crazy, sober and not drunk. They should walk on solid ground, and not roam the clouds hanging to a bag of gas.

Rights may be real or unreal. Principles may be true or false; but even the best and truest can not safely be pushed too far, or in the wrong direction. The principle of truth itself may be carried into absurdity. The saying is old that truth should not be spoken at all times; and those whom a sick conscience worries into habitual violation of the maxim are imbeciles and nuisances. Religion may pass into morbid enthusiasm or wild fanaticism, and turn from a blessing to a curse. So the best of political principles must be kept within bounds of reason, or they will work mischief. That greatest and most difficult of sciences, the science of government, dealing with interests so delicate, complicated, and antagonistic, becomes a perilous guide when it deserts the ways of temperance.

## SHALL WE STAND BY AMERICAN PRINCIPLES?

The suffragists' idea of government is not practical, but utterly unpractical. It is not American, but French. It is that government of abstractions and generalities which found its realization in the French revolution, and its apostle in the depraved and half-crazy man of genius, Jean Jacques Rousseau. The French had an excuse for their frenzy in the crushing oppression they had just flung off and in their inexperience of freedom. We have no excuse. Since the nation began we have been free, and our liberty is in danger from nothing but its own excesses. Since France learned to subject the ideas of Rousseau to the principles of stable freedom embodied in the parliamentary government of England and in our own republicanism, she has emerged from alternate tumult and despotism to enter the paths of hope and progress.

The government of abstractions has been called sometimes the *a priori*, and sometimes the sentimental, method. We object to this last term, unless it is carefully defined. Sentiments, like principles, enter into the life of nations as well as that of individuals; and they are vital to both. But they should be healthy, and not morbid; rational, and not extravagant. It is not common sense alone that makes the greatness of states; neither is it sentiments and principles alone. It is these last joined with reason, reflection, and moderation. Through this union it is that one small island has become the mighty mother of nations; and it is because we ourselves, her greatest offspring, have chosen the paths of Hampden, Washington, and Franklin, and not those of Rousseau, that we have passed safe through every danger, and become the wonder and despair of despotism.

Out of the wholesome fruits of the earth, and the staff of life itself, the perverse chemistry of man distills delirious vapors, which, condensed and bottled, exalt his brain with glorious fantasies, and then leave him in the mud. So it is with the unhappy suffragists. From the sober words of our ancestors they extract the means of mental inebriety. Because the fathers of the Republic gave certain reasons to emphasize their creed that America should not be taxed because America was not represented in the British Parliament, they cry out that we must fling open the flood gates to vaster tides of ignorance and folly, strengthen the evil of our system and weaken the good, feed old abuses, hatch new ones, and expose all our large cities—we speak with deliberate conviction—to the risk of anarchy.

Neither Congress, nor the States, nor the united voice of the whole people could permanently change the essential relations of the sexes. Universal female suffrage, even if decreed, would undo itself in time; but the attempt to establish it would work deplorable mischief. The question is, whether the persistency of a few agitators shall plunge us blindfold into the most reckless of all experiments; whether we shall adopt this supreme device for developing the defects of women, and demolish their real power to build an ugly mockery instead. For the sake of womanhood, let us hope not. In spite of the effect on the popular mind of the incessant repetition of a few trite falacies, and in spite of the squeamishness that prevents the vast majority averse to the movement from uttering a word against it, let us trust that the good sense of the American people will vindicate itself against this most unnatural and pestilent revolution. In the full and normal development of womanhood lie the best interests of the world. Let us labor earnestly for it; and, that we may not labor in vain, let us save women from the barren perturbations of deliverance politics. Let us respect them; and, that we may do so, let us pray for American from female suffrage.

The minority also desire to submit the report of the Judiciary Committee of the House in the Forty-eighth Congress, as follows:

[House Report No. 133]. Forty-eighth Congress, first session.]

The right of suffrage is not and never has, under our system of government, been one of the essential rights of citizenship. Like other rights, whether founded in natural law or not, the right to vote has always been treated in the practice of civilized nations as a strictly civil right, purely derivative from and regulated by each society according to its own circumstances and interests. Certain classes, which will readily occur to the mind, have been almost universally excluded from the privilege.

The Constitution of our Federal Union did not assume to interfere with the established rule of local rights and class exclusion. By the original Constitution of 1789 the whole organism of each body-politic participating in federation, and which, as a colony or State, formed one of the constituents of the Union, was left to itself. What class or portion of the whole people of any State should be admitted to suffrage, and should, by virtue of such admission, exert the active and potential control in the direction of its affairs, was a question reserved exclusively for the determination of the State. There was no limitation placed upon the power of the State except what may be inferred from



the constitutional requirement that the United States should guaranty to each State a republican form of Government. It has never been seriously insisted upon that this guaranty involved the power to regulate suffrage. It formed States with a republican form of government which denied civil as well as political rights to a large mass of its population. It formed States wherein the mass of its people were held in bondage as slaves. The guaranty of a republican form of Government to each State did not require the United States to elevate slaves to a condition of freedom, or confer upon them the condition of suffrage. This principle of independence prevailed not alone as to State governments, but even as to suffrage when exercised in the election of Representatives in Congress.

It is claimed that there is a very close analogy existing between the present condition of women denied the political privilege of suffrage and that of the former slaves, and that the same reasons which operated to induce the adoption of the amendments placing a limit on the originally exclusive right of each State to regulate suffrage, should be made to apply to what is commonly known and called woman suffrage. Indeed, the expressed object of the proposed amendment is to further limit the powers of the State in the premises by forbidding that sex should be a bar to the exercise of suffrage.

That the analogy claimed exists, and that like reasons support the proposed amendment as were successfully urged in the case of the slave, your committee deny. When the thirteenth amendment was adopted by the States, declaring slavery at an end, an act, not of the United States, but of the several States ratifying the same, under the terms of the Constitution, a new condition of things arose, for which the States provided new amendments. The civil rights of the newly-emancipated race were secured by the fourteenth amendment, prescribing limits to State power, and the two races, which had hitherto stood on unequal grounds under and before the law, were placed upon a plane of civil equality. All civil rights and privileges accorded to one were thus guarantied to both races.

Under the influence of a just fear that without suffrage as a protective power to the newly-acquired rights and privileges guarantied to the former slave he might suffer detriment, and with this dominant motive in view, originated the fifteenth amendment. It will be noted that by this latter amendment the privilege of suffrage is not sought to be conferred on any class; but an inhibition is placed upon the States from excluding from the privilege of suffrage any class on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Other limitations not trespassing upon these inhibitions might and do continue to exist in all the States. The dangers apprehended and guarded against by constitutional enactments at the time of the adoption of the amendments cited are embraced in the history of our day, and are beyond the pale of doubt or dispute. Two heterogeneous races, wholly separated in social position by previous historic relations, and without kindred sympathies, would naturally be so antagonized in interest that power committed exclusively to the hands of one might be abused to the injury of the other. In order, therefore, that each might be self-protected, power was given to both.

Such, in brief, is the history of the later constitutional amendments, the motives and circumstances which compassed their origin, and the theory upon which they rest. The condition of slavery, alleged as existing in the case of woman, is wholly without foundation in fact, unless the condition which nature assigns her is to be so construed and considered. Her functions in civil society are co-ordinate with those of man, differing in their sphere of action, but not antagonistic. Woman is not the slave, but the companion, of man. Her duties are as noble as his, though widely differing. Her true sphere is not restricted, but is boundless in resources and consequences. In it she may employ every energy of the mind and every affection of the heart, while within its limitless compass, under Providence, she exercises a power and influence beyond all other agencies for good. She trains and guides the life that is, and forms it for the eternity and immortality that are to be. From the rude contact of life, man is her shield. He is her guardian from its conflicts. He is the defender of her rights in his home, and the avenger of her wrongs everywhere. In the shadow of this defense not only is she shielded and protected, but in it man himself is permitted to play his most exalted part in the social economy.

The Christian system conserves the peace and harmony of their home and invests with sacred solemnity their relations of man and wife. To the husband, by natural allotment in such a home, fall the duties which protect and provide for the household, and to the wife the more quiet and secluded but no less exalted duties of mother to their children and mistress of the domicile. To permit the entrance of political contention into such a home would be either useless or pernicious—useless if man and wife agree, and pernicious if they differ. In the former event the volume of ballots alone would be increased without changing results. In the latter the peace and contentment of home would be exchanged for the bedlam of political debate and become the scene of base and demoralizing intrigue. The exceptional cases of unmarried females are too rare to change the general policy, while expectancy and hope, con-

stantly being realized in marriage, are happily extinguishing the exceptions and bringing all within the rule which governs wife and matron.

In respect to married women, it may well be doubted whether the influences which result from the laws of property between man and wife would not make it improbable that the woman should exercise her suffrage with freedom and independence. This, too, in despite of the fact that the dependence of woman under the common law has been almost entirely obliterated by statutory enactments. At all events, the power proposed to pass laws to carry woman suffrage into effect would be held to give Congress the power to intrude upon the marital relations in the States and the rights of property incident thereto, and as to which your committee see great objection. In answer to the question often suggested as to what proportion and what class of women would avail themselves of the privilege of suffrage if extended to women, your committee are of the opinion that while a few intelligent women, such as appeared before the committee in advocacy of the pending measure, would defy all obstacles in the way of their casting the ballot, yet the great mass of the intelligent, refined, and judicious, with the becoming modesty of their sex, would shrink from the rude contact of the crowd, and, with the exceptions mentioned, leaving the ignorant and vile the exclusive right to speak for the gentler sex in public affairs.

Your committee are of the opinion that the general policy of female suffrage should remain in abeyance, in so far as the General Government is concerned, until the States and communities directly chargeable under our system of government with the exercise and regulation of this privilege shall put the seal of affirmation upon it; and there certainly can be no reason for the amendment of the Constitution to settle a question within the jurisdiction of the States, and which they should first settle for themselves. Your committee are not unmindful of the fact that on a submission of the question of extended suffrage in several of the States, a negative answer has been returned by the people thereof. In the opinion of your committee, and in view of the difficulties in repairing an error once fixed upon the fundamental law, great caution is the highest wisdom in amending the Constitution. Such amendment should partake of the character imparted to the instrument itself, which is a thing of growth, not the origin of rights and principles, but sanctifying and confirming great and accepted principles of government of prior existence to itself.

Your committee do not find the principle of female suffrage so universally accepted as that an amendment to the Constitution is demanded to declare and confirm its existence. We therefore recommend that the joint resolution for the submission of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, as proposed, be not adopted.

#### VIEWES OF MR. POLAND.

The undersigned concurs with the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary in recommending that it is inexpedient to submit to the States a constitutional amendment for the establishment of woman suffrage. I concur generally in the argument of the report by which that conclusion is supported, but the report does not state my individual views of the question fully and exactly, and I therefore desire to add a short statement of them. No Government founded upon the principle that sovereignty resides in the people has ever allowed all the people to vote, or to directly participate in the making or administering the laws. Suffrage has never been regarded as the natural right of all the people, or of any particular class or portion of the people. Suffrage is representation, and it has been given in free governments to such class of persons as in their judgment would fairly and safely represent the rights and interests of the whole.

The right has generally, if not universally, been conferred on men above twenty-one years of age, and often this has been restricted by requiring the ownership of property or the payment of taxes.

The great majority of women are either under the age of twenty-one or are married, and therefore under such influence and control as that relation implies and confers.

Is there any necessity for the protection and preservation of the rights of women that they be allowed to vote, and, of course, to hold office and directly to participate in legislation and in the administration of the laws?

Nearly every man who votes has a wife, or mother, or sisters, or daughters; some sustain all these relations, or more than one.

Now, I think it certain that the great majority of men, when voting or when engaged as legislators, or in administering the laws in some official character, or as fully mindful of the interests of all that class with whom they are so closely connected, and whose interests are so bound up with their own, and that, therefore, they fairly represent all the rights and interests of women as well as their own.

Persons who have been accustomed to see legal proceedings in the courts, and occasionally to see a female litigant in court, know very well whether they are apt to suffer wrong because their rights are determined wholly by men. There is just as



little reason for suspicion that their rights are not carefully guarded in legislation, and in every way where legislation can operate.

There is another reason why I think this proposal to enlist the women of the country as a part of its active political force, and cast upon them an equal duty in the political meetings, campaigns, and elections—to make them legislators, jurors, judges, and executive officers, is all wrong. I believe it to be utterly inconsistent with the very nature and constitution of woman, and wholly subversive of the sphere and function she was designed to fill in the home and in society.

The office and duty which nature has devolved upon woman during all the active and vigorous portion of her life would often render it impossible, and still more often indelicate, for her to appear and act in caucuses, conventions, or elections, or to act as a member of a legislature, or as a juror or judge.

I can not bring myself to believe that any large portion of the intelligent women of this country desire any such thing granted them, or would perform any such duties if the chance were offered them.

LUKE P. POLAND.

In the Forty-fifth Congress, second session, Mr. Wadleigh, from the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, made the following report for that committee on June 14, 1878, to wit:

[Senate Report No. 523, Forty-fifth Congress, second session.]

This proposed amendment forbids the United States or any State to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of sex.

If adopted, it will make several millions of female voters, totally inexperienced in political affairs, quite generally dependent upon the other sex, all incapable of performing military duty, and without the power to enforce the laws which their numerical strength may enable them to make, and comparatively very few of whom wish to assume the irksome and responsible political duties which this measure thrusts upon them.

An experiment so novel, a change so great, should only be made slowly and in response to a general public demand, of the existence of which there is no evidence before your committee.

Petitions from various parts of the country, containing by estimate about 30,000 names, have been presented to Congress asking for this legislation.

They were procured through the efforts of woman-suffrage societies, thoroughly organized, with active and zealous managers. The ease with which signatures may be procured to any petition is well known. The small number of petitioners, when compared with that of the intelligent women in the country, is striking evidence that there exists among them no general desire to take up the heavy burden of governing, which so many men seek to evade.

It would be unjust, unwise, and impolitic to impose that burden on the great mass of women throughout the country who do not wish for it, to gratify the comparatively few who do.

It has been strongly urged that without the right of suffrage women are and will be subjected to great oppression and injustice.

But every one who has examined the subject at all knows that without female suffrage legislation for years has improved and is still improving the condition of woman. The disabilities imposed upon her by the common law have, one by one, been swept away, until in most of the States she has the full right to her property and all, or nearly all, the rights which can be granted without impairing or destroying the marriage relation. These changes have been wrought by the spirit of the age, and are not, generally at least, the result of any agitation by women in their own behalf.

Nor can women justly complain of any partiality in the administration of justice. They have the sympathy of judges and particularly of juries to an extent which would warrant loud complaint on the part of their adversaries of the sterner sex. Their appeals to legislatures against injustice are never unheeded, and there is no doubt that when any considerable part of the women of any State really wish for the right to vote it will be granted without the intervention of Congress.

Any State may grant the right of suffrage to women. Some of them have done so to a limited extent, and perhaps with good results. It is evident that in some States public opinion is much more strongly in favor of it than it is in others. Your committee regard it as unwise and inexpedient to enable three-fourths in number of the States, through an amendment to the National Constitution, to force woman suffrage upon the other fourth in which the public opinion of both sexes may be strongly adverse to such a change.

For these reasons your committee report back said resolution, with a recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed.

The minority of the committee also submit the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Mrs. Virginia Minor against Happersett*, delivered by the chief-justice and concurred in by all the justices of that great court, in October, 1874, and reported in 21 Wallace, pages 165 to 178, and respectfully submit that these presentations show conclusively that the claims or pretensions of the woman suffragists are without foundation, and that they have the same remedy for the redress of wrongs that any residents or citizens of their respective States have, and that the respective States have the perfect right and power to grant the right to vote to them or any other class of citizens, and there can be no reason for any appeal to Congress or any action by Congress. The decision of the Supreme Court above referred to is hereto appended.

F. M. COCKERILL.  
JOSEPH E. BROWN.  
SAMUEL PASCO.

---

### OPINION.

The chief-justice delivered the opinion of the court.

The question is presented in this case whether, since the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, a woman, who is a citizen of the United States and of the State of Missouri, is a voter in that State, notwithstanding the provision of the constitution and laws of the State which confine the right of suffrage to men alone. We might, perhaps, decide the case upon other grounds, but this question is fairly made. From the opinion we find that it was the only one decided in the court below, and it is the only one which has been argued here. The case was undoubtedly brought to this court for the sole purpose of having that question decided by us, and in view of the evident propriety there is of having it settled, so far as it can be by such a decision, we have concluded to waive all other considerations and proceed at once to its determination.

It is contended that the provisions of the constitution and laws of the State of Missouri which confine the right of suffrage and registration therefor to men are in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and therefore void. The argument is, that as a woman, born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, is a citizen of the United States and of the State in which she resides, she has the right of suffrage as one of the privileges and immunities of her citizenship, which the State can not by its laws or constitution abridge.

There is no doubt that women may be citizens. They are persons, and by the fourteenth amendment "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof" are expressly declared to be "citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." But, in our opinion, it did not need this amendment to give them that position. Before its adoption the Constitution of the United States did not in terms prescribe who should be citizens of the United States, or of the several States, yet there were necessarily such citizens without such provision. There can not be a nation without a people. The very idea of a political community, such as a nation, implies an association of persons for their general welfare. Each one of the persons associated becomes a member of the nations formed by the association. He owes it allegiance and is entitled to its protection. Allegiance and protection are, in this connection, reciprocal obligations. The one is a compensation for the other; allegiance for protection and protection for allegiance.

For convenience it has been found necessary to give a name to this membership. The object is to designate by a title the person and the relation he bears to the nation. For this purpose the words "subject," "inhabitant," and "citizen" have been used, and the choice between them is sometimes made to depend upon the form of the government. Citizen is now more commonly employed, however, and as it has been considered better suited to the description of one living under a republican government, it was adopted by nearly all of the States upon their separation from Great Britain, and was afterwards adopted in the Articles of Confederation and in the Constitution of the United States. When used in this sense it is understood as conveying the idea of membership of a nation, and nothing more.

To determine, then, who were citizens of the United States before the adoption of the amendment it is necessary to ascertain what persons originally associated themselves together to form the nation, and what were afterwards admitted to membership.



Looking at the Constitution itself we find that it was ordained and established by "the people of the United States," and then going further back, we find that these were the people of the several States that had before dissolved the political bands which connected them with Great Britain, and assumed a separate and equal station among the powers of the earth, and that had by Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, in which they took the name of "the United States of America," entered into a firm league of friendship with each other for their common defense, the security of their liberties and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to or attack made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever.

Whoever, then, was one of the people of either of these States when the Constitution of the United States was adopted, became *ipso facto* a citizen—a member of the nation created by its adoption. He was one of the persons associating together to form the nation, and was, consequently, one of its original citizens. As to this there has never been a doubt. Disputes have arisen as to whether or not certain persons or certain classes of persons were part of the people at the time, but never as to their citizenship if they were.

Additions might always be made to the citizenship of the United States in two ways: First, by birth, and second by naturalization. This is apparent from the Constitution itself, for it provides that "no person except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President," and that Congress shall have power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." Thus new citizens may be born or they may be created by naturalization.

The Constitution does not, in words, say who shall be natural-born citizens. Resort must be had elsewhere to ascertain that. At common law, with the nomenclature of which the framers of the Constitution were familiar, it was never doubted that all children born in a country of parents who were its citizens became themselves, upon their birth, citizens also. These were natives, or natural-born citizens, as distinguished from aliens or foreigners. Some authorities go further and include as citizens children born within the jurisdiction without reference to the citizenship of their parents. As to this class there have been doubts, but never as to the first. For the purposes of this case it is not necessary to solve these doubts. It is sufficient for everything we have now to consider that all children born of citizen parents within the jurisdiction are themselves citizens. The words "all children" are certainly as comprehensive, when used in this connection, as "all persons," and if females are included in the last they must be in the first; that they are included in the last is not denied. In fact the whole argument of the plaintiffs proceeds upon that idea.

Under the power to adopt a uniform system of naturalization Congress, as early as 1790, provided "that any alien, being a free white person," might be admitted as a citizen of the United States, and that the children of such persons so naturalized, dwelling within the United States, being under twenty-one years of age at the time of such naturalization, should also be considered citizens of the United States, and that the children of citizens of the United States that might be born beyond the sea, or out of the limits of the United States, should be considered as natural-born citizens. These provisions thus enacted have, in substance, been retained in all the naturalization laws adopted since. In 1855, however, the last provision was somewhat extended, and all persons theretofore born or thereafter to be born out of the limits of the jurisdiction of the United States, whose fathers were, or should be at the time of their birth, citizens of the United States, were declared to be citizens also.

As early as 1804 it was enacted by Congress that when any alien who had declared his intention to become a citizen in the manner provided by law died before he was actually naturalized, his widow and children should be considered as citizens of the United States, and entitled to all rights and privileges as such upon taking the necessary oath; and in 1855 it was further provided that any woman who might lawfully be naturalized under the existing laws, married, or who should be married to a citizen of the United States, should be deemed and taken to be a citizen.

From this it is apparent that from the commencement of the legislation upon this subject alien women and alien minors could be made citizens by naturalization, and we think it will not be contended that this would have been done if it had not been supposed that native women and native minors were already citizens by birth.

But if more is necessary to show that women have always been considered as citizens the same as men, abundant proof is to be found in the legislative and judicial history of the country. Thus, by the Constitution, the judicial power of the United States is made to extend to controversies between citizens of different States. Under this it has been uniformly held that the citizenship necessary to give the courts of the United States jurisdiction of a cause must be affirmatively shown on the record. Its existence as a fact may be put in issue and tried. If found not to exist the case must be dismissed. Notwithstanding this the records of the courts are full of cases in

which the jurisdiction depends upon the citizenship of women, and not one can be found, we think, in which objection was made on that account. Certainly none can be found in which it has been held that women can not sue or be sued in the courts of the United States. Again, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, in many of the States (and in some probably now) aliens could not inherit or transmit inheritance. There are a multitude of cases to be found in which the question has been presented whether a woman was or was not an alien, and as such capable or incapable of inheritance, but in no one has it been insisted that she was not a citizen because she was a woman. On the contrary, her right to citizenship has been in all cases assumed. The only question has been whether, in the particular case under consideration, she had availed herself of the right.

In the legislative department of the Government similar proof will be found. Thus, in the pre-emption laws, a widow, "being a citizen of the United States," is allowed to make settlement on the public lands and purchase upon the terms specified, and women, "being citizens of the United States," are permitted to avail themselves of the benefit of the homestead law.

Other proof of like character might be found, but certainly more can not be necessary to establish the fact that sex has never been made one of the elements of citizenship in the United States. In this respect men have never had an advantage over women. The same laws precisely apply to both. The fourteenth amendment did not affect the citizenship of women any more than it did of men. In this particular, therefore, the rights of Mrs. Minor do not depend upon the amendment. She has always been a citizen from her birth, and entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizenship. The amendment prohibited the State, of which she is a citizen, from abridging any of her privileges and immunities as a citizen of the United States; but it did not confer citizenship on her. That she had before its adoption.

If the right of suffrage is one of the necessary privileges of a citizen of the United States, then the constitution and laws of Missouri confining it to men are in violation of the Constitution of the United States, as amended, and consequently void. The direct question is therefore presented whether all citizens are necessarily voters.

The Constitution does not define the privileges and immunities of citizens. For that definition we must look elsewhere. In this case we need not determine what they are, but only whether suffrage is necessarily one of them.

It certainly is nowhere made so in express terms. The United States has no voters in the States of its own creation. The elective officers of the United States are all elected directly or indirectly by State voters. The members of the House of Representatives are chosen by the people of the States, and the electors in each State must have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Senators are to be chosen by the legislatures of the States, and necessarily the members of the legislature required to make the choice are elected by the voters of the State. Each State must appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, the electors to elect the President and Vice-President. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives are to be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators. It is not necessary to inquire whether this power of supervision thus given to Congress is sufficient to authorize any interference with the State laws prescribing the qualifications of voters, for no such interference has ever been attempted. The power of the State in this particular is certainly supreme until Congress acts.

The amendment did not add to the privileges and immunities of a citizen. It simply furnished an additional guaranty for the protection of such as he already had. No new voters were necessarily made by it. Indirectly it may have had that effect because it may have increased the number of citizens entitled to suffrage under the constitutions and laws of the States, but it operates for this purpose, if at all, through the States and the State laws, and not directly upon the citizen.

It is clear, therefore, we think, that the Constitution has not added the right of suffrage to the privileges and immunities of citizenship as they existed at the time it was adopted. This makes it proper to inquire whether suffrage was co-extensive with the citizenship of the States at the time of its adoption. If it was, then it may with force be argued that suffrage was one of the rights which belongs to citizenship, and in the enjoyment of which every citizen must be protected; but if it was not, the contrary may with propriety be assumed.

When the Federal Constitution was adopted all the States, with the exception of Rhode Island and Connecticut, had constitutions of their own. These two continued to act under their charters from the Crown. Upon an examination of those constitutions we find that in no State were all citizens permitted to vote. Each State determined for itself who should have that power; thus, in New Hampshire, "every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges and places unincorporated in the State, of twenty-one years of age and upwards, excepting paupers and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request," were its voters; in Massa-



Massachusetts, "every male inhabitant of twenty-one years of age and upwards having a freehold estate within the Commonwealth of the annual income of £3, or any estate of the value of £60;" in Rhode Island, "such as are admitted free of the company and society" of the colony; in Connecticut, such persons as had "maturity in years, quiet and peaceable behavior, a civil conversation, and 40 shillings freehold, or £40 personal estate," if so certified by the selectmen; in New York, "every male inhabitant of full age, and who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of the State for six months immediately preceding the day of election, \* \* \* if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder, possessing a freehold of the value of £20 within the county, or have rented a tenement therein of the yearly value of 40 shillings, and been rated and actually paid taxes to the State;" in New Jersey, "all inhabitants \* \* \* of full age who are worth £50, proclamation money, clear estate in the same, and have resided in the county in which they claim a vote for twelve months immediately preceding the election;" in Pennsylvania, "every freeman of the age of twenty-one years, having resided in the State two years next before the election, and within that time paid a State or county tax which shall have been assessed at least six months before the election;" in Delaware and Virginia, "as exercised by law at present;" in Maryland, "all freemen above twenty-one years of age having a freehold of 50 acres of land in the county in which they offer to vote and residing therein, and all freemen having property in the State above the value of £30 current money, and having resided in the county in which they offer to vote one whole year next preceding the election;" in North Carolina, for senators, "all freemen of the age of twenty-one years who have been inhabitants of any one county within the State twelve months immediately preceding the day of election, and possessed of a freehold within the same county of 50 acres of land for six months next before and at the day of election," and for the members of the house of commons "all freemen of the age of twenty-one years who have been inhabitants in any one county within the State twelve months immediately preceding the day of any election, and shall have paid public taxes;" in South Carolina, "every free white man of the age of twenty-one years, being a citizen of the State and having resided therein two years previous to the day of election, and who hath a freehold of 50 acres of land, or a town lot of which he hath been legally seized and possessed at least six months before such election, or (not having such freehold or town lot) hath been a resident within the election district in which he offers to give his vote six months before said election, and hath paid a tax the preceding year of 3 shillings sterling towards the support of the government;" and in Georgia, such "citizens and inhabitants of the State as shall have attained the age of twenty-one years, and shall have paid tax for the year next preceding the election, and shall have resided six months within the county."

In this condition of the law in respect to suffrage in the several States it can not for a moment be doubted that if it had been intended to make all citizens of the United States voters, the framers of the Constitution would not have left it to implication. So important a change in the condition of citizenship as it actually existed, if intended, would have been expressly declared.

But if further proof is necessary to show that no such change was intended, it can easily be found both in and out of the Constitution. By article 4, section 2, it is provided that "citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." If suffrage is necessarily a part of citizenship, then the citizens of each State must be entitled to vote in the several States precisely as their citizens are. This is more than asserting that they may change their residence and become citizens of the State and thus be voters. It goes to the extent of insisting that while retaining their original citizenship they may vote in any State. This, we think, has never been claimed. And again, by the very terms of the amendment we have been considering (the fourteenth), "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridge, except for participation in the rebellion, or other crimes, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State." Why this, if it was not in the power of the legislature to deny the right of suffrage to some male inhabitants? And if suffrage was necessarily one of the absolute rights of citizenship, why confine the operation of the limitation to male inhabitants? Women and children are, as we have seen, "persons." They are counted in the enumeration upon which the apportionment is to be made, but if they were necessarily voters because of their citizenship, unless clearly excluded, why inflict the penalty for the exclusion of males alone? Clearly no

such form of words would have been selected to express the idea here indicated if suffrage was the absolute right of all citizens.

And still again, after the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, it was deemed necessary to adopt a fifteenth, as follows: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The fourteenth amendment had already provided that no State should make or enforce any law which should abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States. If suffrage was one of these privileges or immunities, why amend the Constitution to prevent its being denied on account of race, etc.? Nothing is more evident than that the greater must include the less, and if all were already protected why go through with the form of amending the Constitution to protect a part?

It is true that the United States guaranties to every State a republican form of government. It is also true that no State can pass a bill of attainder, and that no person can be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. All these several provisions of the Constitution must be construed in connection with the other parts of the instrument, and in the light of the surrounding circumstances.

The guaranty is of a republican form of government. No particular government is designated as republican; neither is the exact form to be guarantied in any manner especially designated. Here, as in other parts of the instrument, we are compelled to resort elsewhere to ascertain what was intended.

The guaranty necessarily implies a duty on the part of the States themselves to provide such a government. All the States had governments when the Constitution was adopted. In all the people participated to some extent, through their representatives elected in the manner specially provided. These governments the Constitution did not change. They were accepted precisely as they were, and it is, therefore, to be presumed that they were such as it was the duty of the States to provide. Thus we have unmistakable evidence of what was republican in form, within the meaning of that term as employed in the Constitution.

As has been seen, all the citizens of the States were not invested with the right of suffrage. In all, save perhaps New Jersey, this right was only bestowed upon men and not upon all of them. Under these circumstances it is certainly now too late to contend that a government is not republican, within the meaning of this guaranty in the Constitution, because women are not made voters.

The same may be said of the other provisions just quoted. Women were excluded from suffrage in nearly all the States by the express provision of their constitutions and laws. If that had been equivalent to a bill of attainder, certainly its abrogation would not have been left to implication. Nothing less than express language would have been employed to effect so radical a change. So also of the amendment which declares that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, adopted as it was as early as 1791. If suffrage was intended to be included within its obligations, language better adapted to express that intent would most certainly have been employed. The right of suffrage, when granted, will be protected. He who has it can only be deprived of it by due process of law, but in order to claim protection he must first show that he has the right.

But we have already sufficiently considered the proof found upon the inside of the Constitution. That upon the outside is equally effective.

The Constitution was submitted to the States for adoption in 1787, and was ratified by nine States in 1788, and finally by the thirteen original States in 1790. Vermont was the first new State admitted to the Union, and it came in under a constitution which conferred the right of suffrage only upon men of the full age of twenty-one years, having resided in the State for the space of one whole year next before the election, and who were of quiet and peaceable behavior. This was in 1791. The next year, 1792, Kentucky followed with a constitution confining the right of suffrage to free male citizens of the age of twenty-one years who had resided in the State two years or in the county in which they offered to vote one year next before the election. Then followed Tennessee, in 1796, with voters of freemen of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, possessing a freehold in the county wherein they may vote, and being inhabitants of the State or freemen being inhabitants of any one county in the State six months immediately preceding the day of election.

But we need not particularize further. No new State has ever been admitted to the Union which has conferred the right of suffrage upon women, and this has never been considered a valid objection to her admission. On the contrary, as is claimed in the argument, the right of suffrage was withdrawn from women as early as 1807 in the State of New Jersey, without any attempt to obtain the interference of the United States to prevent it. Since then the governments of the insurgent States have been reorganized under a requirement that before their Representatives could be admitted to seats in Congress they must have adopted new constitutions, republican in form. In no one of these constitutions was suffrage conferred upon women, and yet the States have all been restored to their original positions as States in the Union.



Besides this, citizenship has not in all cases been made a condition precedent to the enjoyment of the right of suffrage. Thus, in Missouri, persons of foreign birth who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States may under certain circumstances vote. The same provision is to be found in the constitution of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, and Texas.

Certainly, if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly ninety years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not necessarily confer the right of suffrage. If uniform practice, long continued, can settle the construction of so important an instrument as the Constitution of the United States confessedly is, most certainly it has been done here. Our province is to decide what the law is, and not to declare what it should be.

We have given this case the careful consideration its importance demands. If the law is wrong, it ought to be changed, but the power for that is not with us. The arguments addressed to us bearing upon such a view of the subject may perhaps be sufficient to induce those having the power to make the alteration; but they ought not to be permitted to influence our judgment in determining the present rights of the parties now litigating before us. No argument as to woman's need of suffrage can be considered. We can only act upon her rights as they exist. It is not for us to look at the hardship of withholding. Our duty is at an end if we find it is within the power of a State to withhold.

Being unanimously of the opinion that the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one, and that the constitution and laws of the several States which commit that important trust to men alone are not necessarily void, we affirm the judgment.

○

